THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

ary

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London

GURNEY

WOODSTOCK ST W.

616972

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

FIFTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

4 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXXXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JULY
TO THE NINTH DAY OF AUGUST, 1904.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1904.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols. ; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal ; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621 ; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols. ; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols. : Almon's Debates, 24 vols. ; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols. ; The Hardwicke Papers ; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table :—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41 Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42 Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7 Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2 Will. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3 —	1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4 Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5 —	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6 Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7 —	1836
— 36 — 38	8 —	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44...	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50...	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55...	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58...	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65...	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71...	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76...	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82...	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88...	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94...	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101...	11	—	1848
—	102 —107...	12	—	1849
—	108 —113...	13	—	1850
—	114 —118...	14	—	1851
—	119 —122...	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129...	16	—	1853
—	130 —135...	17	—	1854
—	136 —139...	18	—	1855
—	140 —143...	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147...	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 —151...	21	—	1858
—	152 —153...	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155...	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 —160...	23	—	1860
—	161 —164...	24	—	1861
—	165 —168...	25	—	1862
—	169 —172...	26	—	1863
—	173 —176...	27	—	1864
—	177 —180...	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184...	29	Victoria......	1866
—	185 —189...	30	—	1867
—	190 —193...	31	—	... 1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198...	32	Victoria	... 1868-9
—	199 —203...	33	—	1870
—	204 —208...	34	—	1871
—	209 —213...	35	—	1872
—	214 —217...	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221...	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 —226...	38	—	1875
—	227 —231...	39	—	1876
—	232 —236...	40	—	1877
—	237 —242...	41	—	1878
—	243 —249...	42	—	... 1878-9
—	250 & 251...	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256...	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 —265...	44	—	1881
—	266 —273...	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275...	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283...	46	—	1883
—	284 —292...	47	—	1884
—	293 —301...	48	—	... 1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307...	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309...	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321...	50	—	1887
—	322 —332...	51	—	1888
—	333 —340...	52	—	1889
—	341 —348...	53	—	1890
—	349 —356...	54	—	... 1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6...	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21...	57	—	... 1893-4
—	22 — 29...	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35...	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44...	59	—	... 1895-6
—	45 — 52...	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65...	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76...	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83...	63	—	1900
—	84 ...	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87...	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	...1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	...1901
—	101 ...	1 & 2	—	...1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	...1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	...1903
—	129 to 139	4	—	...1904

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education——Most Hon. the Marquess of Londonderry, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Victor Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  Lord Balcarres, M.P.
  Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
  Rear-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury, K.C.S.I.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Rear-Admiral John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  Lt.-Gen. Sir N. G. Lyttelton, K.C.B.
  Major-General C. W. H. Douglas.
  Major-General H. C. O. Plumer, C.B.
  Major-General Sir J. W. Murray, K.C.B.
  The Under-Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War (Col. Sir E. W. D. Ward, K.C.B.).
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——Arthur H. Lee, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Donoughmore.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——W. Bromley Davenport, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. Sir E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
The Lord Advocate——C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Vice-Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Lord Wolverton.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——Sir Savile Crossley, Bt., M.V.O., M.P.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——The Marquess of Hamilton, M.P.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.

Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinross.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——David Dundas, Esq., K.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Under Secretary——Sir Antony McDonnell, G.C.S.I.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——J. H. M. Campbell, Esq., K.C., M.P.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; and G. D. Luard, Esq.
Accountant and Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court.
Assistant Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.

Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.; H. C. Tower Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq., C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq.; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq.; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq., C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.,
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——H. Otway Mayne, Esq.; John Poyser, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——Temple Franks, Esq., B.C.L.; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman, J. Surrey, A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. Inglefield and Mr. H. Hambling.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Tye, Mr. R Hobby, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day.

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. Henderson, G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington, H. G. Emmett, J. L. Philip.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram and J. Hart.

Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXXXIX.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1904.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 29TH JULY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 1

Rotherham Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 1

Selby Urban District Council Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1

Local Government Provisional Orders (No 13) Bill—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Emly be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Armstrong; read, and agreed to. 1

Swindon Corporation Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 2

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons 2

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Aberdeen City Improvements, was presented by the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*); read 1^a; to be printed; and pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^a, (the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*); and reported from the Committee. (No. 168.) 2

July 29.] *Page*

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. (No. 169).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Ayr Corporation Tramways; and 2

Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 170). —A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Glasgow Corporation (Sewage)—Were presented by the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*) (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Sections 8 and 9); read 1ª; and to be printed. 2

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next 3

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next 3

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3240. United States (Savannah).

No. 3241. Paraguay.

No. 3242. Japan (North Formosa). 3

IMPERIAL DEFENCE COMMITTEE.—Treasury Minute, dated 4th May, 1904, as to Secretariat 3

TRAMWAYS ACT, 1870.—Report by the Board of Trade of their proceedings under the Tramways Act, 1870, during the session of 1904 3

METROPOLITAN GAS COMMITTEE.—Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to gas-testing in the Metropolis. Part II. Evidence and Appendices. 3

ROYAL OBSERVATORY, GREENWICH.—Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich 3

WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOUR, BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT).—Report on changes in rates of wages and hours of labour in the United Kingdom in 1903; with comparative statistics for 1894-1902 3

STATISTICS.—Statistical abstract for the principal and other foreign countries in each year from 1892 to 1901-1902 (as far as the particulars can be stated). Thirtieth Number. 4

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Report on American manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain. Volume I.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 4

July 29.] *Page*

Lunacy.—Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ended the 30th June, 1904. 4

Polling Districts (County of Hertford).—Orders made by the County Council of the County of Hertford, re-dividing into polling districts—

The Eastern or Hertford Parliamentary Division ; the Mid or St. Albans Parliamentary Division.

Laid before the House (pursuant to the Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 4

Finance Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª.
Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order).

Moved, "That the said Standing Order be suspended for this day's sitting."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Earl Spencer 4
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 7
Lord James of Hereford 9
The Earl of Camperdown 10
Lord Coleridge 13
The Earl of Portsmouth 14
Lord Newton 16
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 17
Lord Burghclere 19
Earl Carrington 20

On Question.

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 31 ; Not-contents, 11.

Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended, Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Lord Coleridge 23
The Marquess of Lansdowne 28
Earl Spencer 30
Earl Beauchamp 32
The Earl of Portsmouth 37

On Question.

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 42 ; Not-Contents, 8.

Bill read 2ª accordingly.

Moved, "That the Bill be committed."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth — 41
The Marquess of Lansdowne 41
Lord Coleridge 41
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 42

On Question, Motion negatived.

July 29.] *Pag*

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Earl Beauchamp 4
The Earl of Portsmouth 4
Lord Coleridge 44
The Marquess of Lansdowne 44
Earl Carrington 44

On Question, Bill read 3ª, and passed.

Licensing Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday next.—(*The Lord Belper.*) (No. 171.)

THE MILITIA FORCE.

The Earl of Wemyss 48

Moved to resolve, " That, in the opinion of this House, any scheme of Army re-organisation that does away with the Militia force is contrary to sound policy, destroying as it does the ancient constitutional foundation of our existing military system."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

Earl Spencer 50
Lord Harris 51
Lord Raglan 55
The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 60
Lord Burghclere 63
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*The Earl of Selborne*) 66
The Earl of Wemyss 70

On Question, resolved in the affirmative.

Army Council Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 71

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Earl Spencer 71
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*The Earl of Selborne*) 73

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

Wild Birds Protection Acts Amendment (St. Kilda) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 74

Dean Forest Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

County Courts Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order).

Lord Coleridge 75

Amendments moved—

> "In page 1, Clause 1, line 12, after the word 'eighty-one,' to insert the word 'and'; and in line 13, to leave out the words 'and one hundred and sixteen.'"—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 75

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "After Clause 6, to insert as a new clause the words, 'Section thirty-one of the principal Act as to the appointment of deputy registrars shall apply to the appointment of deputy high bailiffs, with the substitution of the words 'high bailiff' for the word 'registrar.'"—(*The Earl of Halsbury*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 11, page 5, line 4, after the word 'conviction' to insert the words 'and the said section shall apply to any case in which any officer or bailiff of any Court or any person put into possession of goods seized under any process of the Court by a bailiff of any Court is assaulted or obstructed while in the execution of his duty, and to any case of rescue or attempted rescue of any person arrested under process of the Court.'"—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "After Clause 12, to insert as a new clause, 'The extended jurisdiction exercisable in County Courts under this Act shall be exercisable in like manner in the City of London.'"—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 172.)

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order).

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

Clause 5.

Earl Waldegrave 77

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 5, page 2, line 36, to insert as a new sub-section, '(1) This Act shall not extend to Ireland.'"—(*Earl Waldegrave.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived: The Report of Amendment to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 173.)

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].

A Bill to regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland was presented by the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*); read 1_a; and to be printed. (No. 167.) .. 77

House adjourned at five minutes past Eight o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS; FRIDAY, 29TH JULY, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill; Torquay Tramways Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 77

De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 77

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered. Two Clauses added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.. .. 77

King's College Hospital Bill [Lords].—Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time .. 77

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 78

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 78

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 78

North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords] (by Order).—As amended, considered; a clause added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.. 78

Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill—Read the third time, and passed 78

Hamilton Gas Power Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 78

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time upon Tuesday next 78

July 29.] *Page*

Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Tuesday next... 78

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 78

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.. 78

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill; Felixstowe Gas Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill; South Shields Gas Bill, with Amendments 78

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Broughton Moor; Coton in the Elms; Kirkham; North Cave; and South Shields; to lie upon the Table 78

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Farnworth, against; to lie upon the Table .. 79

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.—Petitions from Morecambe, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 79

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain. Vol. I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 79

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF HERTFORD).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Hertford redividing the Mid of St. Albans Parliamentary Division into Polling Districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 79

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF HERTFORD).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Hertford re-dividing the Eastern or Hertford Parliamentary Division into Polling Districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 79

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 21st July; *Mr. Lloyd Morgan*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.] 79

DEATHS FROM STARVATION OR ACCELERATED BY PRIVATION (LONDON).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 3rd March; *Mr. Talbot*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289.] 79

COUNTY AND BOROUGH LUNATIC ASYLUMS.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 13th June; *Mr. Charles Hobhouse*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 290.] 79

SHOPS.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 13th June; *Sir Charles Dilke*]; to lie upon the table, and to be printed. [No. 291.] 79

July 29.] *Page*

MOTOR CARS (LICENCES).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th April; *Mr. Scott Montagu*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be prin . . [No. 292.] 80

WOOLLEN, WORSTED, AND SHODDY FACTORIES (INSPECTION).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 2nd May; *Mr. Wanklyn*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 293.] 80

COMMITTEE OF IMPERIAL DEFENCE.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 4th May, 1904, as to Secretariat [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 80

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (FOREIGN COUNTRIES).—Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the principal and other Foreign Countries in each year from 1892 to 1901–2 (Thirtieth Number) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 80

METROPOLITAN GAS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to Gas Testing in the Metropolis. Part II. Evidence and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 80

TRAMWAY ORDERS.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under The Tramways Act, 1870, during the Session of 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 80

MERCHANT SHIPPING, 1903.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th July; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 294.] 80

COAL TABLES, 1903.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th July; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 295.] 80

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

VOTE FOR NATIONAL GALLERY OF SCOTLAND.—Question, Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 81

SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES IN THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 81

THAMES BARRAGE SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 81

CONTRACTS IN CONNECTION WITH LONDON TELEPHONE SERVICE—BRITISH *v.* FOREIGN FIRMS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, Lord Stanley 81

ESTABLISHMENT OF A POST OFFICE IN WAPPING WEST OF WAPPING BRIDGE.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, Lord Stanley 82

WITHDRAWALS FROM POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord Stanley 82

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—DEPOSITS OF SMALL AMOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Stanley 83

July 29.]

Page

Delay in Introduction of Electric Traction on Metropolitan and Metropolitan District Railways.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 83

Duties and Prices of Imported Wheat in United Kingdom and on the Continent.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 84

Ventilation of House of Commons—Firms invited to Tender for New Plant.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Balcarres 85

Erection of New National School at Hatfield.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answer, Sir William Anson 85

Money due to the Commissioners of Public Works by the Irish Society.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 86

Legal Assistance under the Poor Prisoners Defence Act.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 86

Suggested Increase of Wages for Unskilled Labour in Devonport Dockyard.—Question, Mr. Benn (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman .. 87

Petitions of Devonport Dockyard Workers.—Question, Mr. Benn; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 87

By-laws made by Irish Local Authorities under the Employment of Children Act.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 87

First Battalion Lancashire Fusiliers—Prolonged Service Abroad.—Question, Sir Lees Knowles (Salford, W.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 88

Constitution of New Army Finance Department.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 88

Number and Cost of British Troops Stationed in South Africa—Colonial Contributions to Cost.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 89

Number and Cost of British Troops Stationed at Canadian Ports—Canadian Contributions to Cost.—Question, Mr. Runciman; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 89

Powers and Duties of Secretary of State for War proposed to be transferred to the Army Council.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 89

New Writ.—New Writ for the Borough of Reading, in the room of George William Palmer, Esquire (Manor of Northstead).—(*Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

Licensing Bill [Third Reading].—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 90

July 29.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) 98
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 107
Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) 112
Mr. Ellis Griffith 116
Sir John Rolleston (*Leicester*) 119
Sir Wilfrid Lawson (*Cornwall, Camborne*) 121
Mr. Corbett (*Glasgow, Tradeston*) 125
Mr. Whittaker (*Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley*) 128
Mr. Pike Pease (*Darlington*) 137
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 139
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) 142
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 143
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 149

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 217 ; Noes, 129. (Division List No. 289.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Post Office Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

The Postmaster-General (*Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton*) .. 159

Bill reported, without Amendment.

Bill read the third time, and passed

University of Liverpool Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Sir John Brunner (*Cheshire, Northwich*) 159

Bill reported, without Amendment.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to, with an Amendment.

Leeds University Bill.—Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 160
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (*Sir A. Acland Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington*) 160

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS. MONDAY, 1st AUGUST, 1904.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Finance.
2. Savings Banks Acts Amendment.
3. Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station Order Confirmation.
4. Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation.
5. Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation.
6. Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation.
7. Melrose District Water Order Confirmation.
8. Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh).
9. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers).
10. Thurles Urban District Council.
11. Ebbw Vale Urban District Water.
12. Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad.
13. Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways).
14. Metropolitan District Railway.
15. Lytham Improvement.
16. Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment), ... 161

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—County of Suffolk.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table. 161

Aug. 1.] *Page*

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered to-morrow 161

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Great Western Railway Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 161

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 162

Railways (Private Sidings) Bill.—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendment to each Bill agreed to 162

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Tottenham Improvement Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to 162

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 162

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill.—Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill; Torquay Tramways Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to 162

Registration of Clubs (Ireland Bill.—Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to, with an Amendment 162

Leyton Urban District Council Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 162

Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee. (No. 176.) .. 162

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to .. .. 162.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders No. (11) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed. 162

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 163

Aug. 1.] Page

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; of Methodist Conference; Free Christian Church of Croydon; Executive Council of Manchester Sunday School Union; Teachers and Adult Scholars of Friends' First Day School, Manchester; and New Brompton and District Federated Temperance Council.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 163

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for Amendment of; of Inhabitants of Cheltenham; Hampstead Society of Women's Total Abstinence Union; and Persons signing (1). Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 163

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY.—Returns of the number of courts-martial held and summary punishments inflicted on seamen of the Royal Navy, etc., during the year 1903 163

DRAINAGE OF LOUGH NEAGH AND THE LOWER BANN.—Report on the drainage of Lough Neagh and the Lower Bann, furnished to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland by Frederick J. Dick, M.I.C.E., Engineer to the Commissioners, 31st May, 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 163

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill.—Commons Amendment to Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow 163

County of Suffolk Bill.—Examiner's Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee To-morrow .. 163

Post Office Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 174.) 164

University of Liverpool Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª; To-morrow (*The Earl of Derby*). (No. 175.) 164

Licensing Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Belper 164

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Belper.*)

Viscount Peel 175

Amendment moved—

"To leave out all the words after 'That' for the purpose of inserting the following words, 'this House cannot accept as a satisfactory settlement of the licensing question a Bill which creates a perpetual interest in a terminable licence.'"—(*Viscount Peel.*)

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 187
The Marquess of Bath 197
Lord Shuttleworth 201
Viscount Halifax 208

Aug. 1.] Page

Lord Farrer 214
Earl Grey 219
The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Salisbury) 227
Lord Davey 242

Debate adjourned.

County Courts Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 250

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill [H.L.].—Amendment reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 250

House adjourned at half-past Eleven o'clock till To-morrow at a quarter past four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 1st AUGUST, 1904

The House met at Two of the Clock.

Commission.—Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went;—and, being returned;—

Mr. Speaker reported the Royal Assent to—

1. Finance Act, 1904.
2. Savings Banks Act, 1904.
3. Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
4. Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
5. Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
6. Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
7. Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
8. Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Act, 1904.
9. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Act, 1904.
10. Thurles Urban District Council Water Act, 1904.
11. Ebbw Vale Water Act, 1904.
12. Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Act, 1904.
13. Bournemouth Corporation Act, 1904.
14. Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1904.
15. Lytham Improvement Act, 1904.
16. Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Act, 1904. 250

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 251

Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 252

Aug. 1.] *Page*

Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 252

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time. 252

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 252

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—

Finance Bill, without Amendment.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill, with an Amendment.

Dean Forest Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill, with Amendments .. 252

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 252

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Milldamhead; and Tyne Dock; to lie upon the Table 252

Licensing Bill.—Petition from South Shields, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 252

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Army.—Copy presented, of Particulars regarding the proposed Army Organisation Scheme [by Command]; to lie upon the table 252

Army.—Copy presented, of Statement showing the basis on which the estimated extra cost of £25,000,000 for conscription was made [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 252

Drainage of Lough Neagh and the Lower Bann.—Copy presented, of Report on the Drainage of Lough Neagh and the Lower Bann, furnished to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland by Frederick J. Dick, M.I.C.E., Engineer to the Commissioners, 31st May, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 253

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3240 to 3242 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 253

Navy (Courts-Martial).—Copy presented of Return of the number of Courts-Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 253

Public Works Loans Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Statement of Particulars of Loans of which the Balances outstanding are proposed to be remitted or written off (in whole or in part) from the Assets of the Local Loans Fund.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) 253

Aug. 1.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CHARTERED COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 254

SALE OF LIQUOR ON RIVER STEAMERS.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 254

ARMY REORGANISATION.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 254

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Lord Stanley 255

ARMY ESTIMATES.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Foster 256

NEW ARMY SCHEME—EARL ROBERT'S VIEWS.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 256

LOCHCARRON (ROSS-SHIRE) WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 256

CLOSING OF CHANONRY FERRY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 257

ANNUAL LEAVE FOR MEDICAL OFFICERS IN REMOTE HIGHLAND AND ISLAND PARISHES.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 257

DISMISSAL OF THE PARISH DOCTOR OF DURNESS, SUTHERLANDSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 258

ESTABLISHMENT OF A ROYAL NAVAL RESERVE STATION AT ULLAPOOL.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 259

SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO THE MANAGEMENT OF HORTON LUNATIC ASYLUM.—Question, Mr. Whitmore (Chelsea); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 259

OUTDOOR RELIEF—SUPPLY OF PURE MILK FOR CHILDREN.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 259

CASE OF ANTHRAX AT LIVERPOOL.—Question, Mr. Macdona (Southwark, Rotherhithe); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 260

CRETE—EXTENSION OF CLEMENCY TO DR. JAUNARIS.—Question, Capt. Ellice (St. Andrew's Burghs); Answer, Earl Percy 260

TOTAL PRODUCTION OF BRITISH DISTILLERIES.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 260

EARLY CLOSING IN GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 261

REDUCTION OF SALARY OF AN IRISH TEACHER OWING TO REDUCED ATTENDANCE CAUSED BY AN EPIDEMIC.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 262

Aug. 1.] Page

CONNECTION BETWEEN MONASTEREVAN AND CASTLECOMER.—Question, Mr. Hammond (Carlow); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 263

MONEY DUE ON MORTGAGES ON ESTATES OF THE IRISH SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 263

ALLEGED SALE OF DRINK DURING PROHIBITED HOURS AT BALLYNAHINCH.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 263

ARMY REORGANISATION—DEPOT OF ROSS-SHIRE REGIMENTS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 264

ARMY COUNCIL BILL—PROCEDURE WITH REGARD TO WAR DEPARTMENT ORDERS IN COUNCIL.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 264

PENSIONS OF CIVIL SERVANTS SERVING IN NEW GUINEA PREVIOUS TO ITS TRANSFER TO THE AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 264

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ARMY ESTIMATES.—Questions, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 265

ARMY RECRUITING.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 266

LORD ROBERTS AND THE ARMY SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 266

CHINESE INDENTURED LABOUR DEPOTS.—Questions, Mr. Whitley (Halifax) and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 266

RACE TROUBLES IN JOHANNESBURG—REPORT OF LYNCHING.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 267

ISLAND OF TRISTAN D'ACUNHA.—Question, Mr. Fuller (Wiltshire, Westbury); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 267

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER'S STATEMENT ON LABOUR RECRUITING IN CHINA.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 268

LOSSES INFLICTED ON TIBETANS.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 268

FRENCH CONGO—BRITISH MERCHANTS' CLAIMS.—Question, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpoool, Exchange); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 268

CONTRABAND OF WAR.—Questions, Mr. Charles McArthur and Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answers, Earl Percy 269

TRANSVAAL WAR CONTRIBUTION.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 269

Aug. 1.] *Page*

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 270

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION—REPORT OF DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 270

COUNTERFEIT COINING—NEWSPAPER INSTRUCTION.—Question, Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 271

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 271

REV. MR. GLEESON AND THE ROUNDSTONE POLICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 272

KINVARA HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 273

BOYNE SALMON FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 274

RAILWAY FACILITIES IN SLIGO.—Question, Mr. William McKillop (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 275

MOHILL EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 275

NICHOLSON ESTATE, COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 275

CORK PORT SANITARY AUTHORITY—SMALLPOX BY-LAWS.—Questions, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (Cork) and Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 276

ARDAGH BURIAL GROUND.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 277

DOPPING ESTATE, NORTH LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 277

MR. MAHONY'S LAND APPEAL CASE.—Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 277

RATHMINES COMMISSIONERS' APPEAL.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 278

WICKLOW CANTEEN LICENCE.—Questions, Mr. James O'Conner (Wicklow, W.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 278

RUM AND BLACK RIVER DRAINAGE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 279

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF IRELAND—MR. EVANS' SALARY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 279

Aug. 1.] Page

Temporary Assistants in Irish Government Offices.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 280

Irish Art—Grant-in-Aid.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 280

Ecclesiastical Disorders.—Questions, Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) and Dr. Hutchinson (Sussex, Rye); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) .. 281

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill.—Questions, Mr. Farquharson; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 281

Proposed Estimates Committee.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham), and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 282

Public Accounts Committee's Report.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 283

Scottish Estimates.—Question, The Master of Elibank (Edinburgh, Midlothian); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 283

Capital Expenditure [Money].—Committee to consider of authorising the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sum which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and of making provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 284

New Member Sworn.—Allan Heywood Bright, esquire, for the County of Salop (Western or Oswestry Division) 284

Post Office Sites Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 297.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 288.] 284

NEW BILL.

Public Works Loan Bill.—"To grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund; and for other purposes relating to Local Loans," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 289.] 284

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—"To continue various Expiring Laws," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 290.] .. .. .. — 284

Vote of Censure—Ministers of the Crown. (Preferential Duties.)

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 285

Aug. 1.] Page

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House regrets that certain of His Majesty's Ministers have accepted official positions in a political organisation which has formally declared its adhesion to a policy of preferential duties involving the taxation of food."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington*) 297
Mr. Robson (*South Shields*) 302
Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) 309
Mr. Elliot (*Durham*) 315
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 320
Mr. Claude Lowther (*Cumberland, Eskdale*) 327
Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 329
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 340
Mr. Bell (*Derby*) 348

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

VOTE OF CENSURE—MINISTERS OF THE CROWN (PREFERENTIAL DUTIES.)—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question (1st August), "That this House regrets that certain of His Majesty's Ministers have accepted official positions in a political organisation which has formally declared its adhesion to a policy of preferential duties involving the taxation of food."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. Purvis (*Peterborough*) 350
Sir William Holland (*Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham*) 351
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 355
Lieut.-Colonel George Kemp (*Lancashire, Heywood*) 360
Mr. J. F. Hope (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 361
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 362
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 366
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 379

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 210 ; Noes, 288. (Division List No. 290.)

Leeds University Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment ; read the third time, and passed 391

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 2ND AUGUST, 1904.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.—Writs and Returns electing the Lord Bellew a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Viscount Powerscourt, deceased, with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto. Delivered (on oath), and Certificate read .. 393

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill.—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 393

Carlisle Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 393

Loch Leven Water Power Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 393

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill.—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported, with Amendments 393

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next 393

Selby Urban District Council Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 393

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 393

Dean Forest Bill; Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 393

Holywood Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Lothians Elecrtic Power Bill [H.L.]; Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]; Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 393

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Moved, that the Order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Provisional, Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next 394

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 394

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to 394

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill.—Read 1^a; to be printed ; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 178.) 394

Aug. 2.] Page

Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill.—Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

The Acting Chairman of Committees (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) 394

Moved, " That the Order made on the 14th day of March last, ' That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed.

PETITIONS.

His Highness Mahendra Maharajah Madhava Singh.—Petition of, for redress of grievances ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 395

Electric Lighting (London) Bill.—Petition in favour of ; of Metropolitan Borough of Islington ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. ., 395

Licensing Bill.—Petition for Amendment of ; of residents in Hampstead and others ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 395

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Workmen's Compensation.—Report of the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the law relating to compensation for injuries to workmen. Vol. I. Report and Appendices. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 395

Naval Boilers.—Report of the Committee on Naval Boilers 395

Army.—Statement showing the financial effect of certain reductions in, and additions to the Army proposed by the Secretary of State for War.

Statement showing the basis on which the estimated extra cost of £25,900,000 for conscription was made.

Particulars regarding the proposed Army Organisation Scheme .. 395

Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission).—Sixteenth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts 395

Physical Deterioration.—Minutes of Evidence taken before the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. Vol. II. List of witnesses and minutes of evidence 396

Trade Reports (Annual Series).

No. 3243. France (Lyons, St. Etienne, and Grenoble).

No. 3244. Germany (Dantzig).

No. 3245. Uruguay 396

Civil Service Commission.—Forty-eighth Report of His Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners ; with Appendix 396

Aug. 2.] *Page*

SHIPPING CASUALTIES.—Shipping casualties which occurred on or near the coasts, or in rivers and harbours of the United Kingdom, from 1st July, 1902, to 30th June, 1903; and shipping casualties which occurred to British vessels elsewhere than on the coasts of the United Kingdom and to foreign vessels on or near the coasts, or in rivers and harbours of British Possessions abroad, reported during the same period, etc., with charts and appendices 396

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the County of Suffolk Bill ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed. Read, and agreed to 396

County of Suffolk Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Earl Cadogan 396

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Cadogan.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª.

Electric Lighting (London) Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Wolverton 397

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed for Thursday next.

University of Liverpool Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Derby 397

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Leeds University Bill.—Brought from the Commons—read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next.—(*The Marquess of Ripon.*) [No. 177.] 398

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill.—Commons Amendment to Lords Amendments considered (according to Order), and agreed to 398

Licensing Bill—[SECOND READING]

Debate on the Amendment proposed by the Viscount Peel to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2ª, viz.:—

"'To leave out all the words after 'That' for the purpose of inserting the following words, 'This House cannot accept as a satisfactory settlement of the Licensing Question a Bill which creates a perpetual interest in a terminable licence.'"

Resumed (according to order.)

Aug. 2.] *Page*

Earl Spencer 398
The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) 408
The Lord Bishop of London 412
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (The Earl of Onslow) 417
Lord Burghclere 427
Viscount Cross 436
The Earl of Carlisle 447
The Lord Bishop of Durham 451
Lord Kinnaird 457
Earl Stanhope .. .. — .. 462
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans 466
The Earl of Aberdeen 470
The Earl of Lytton 474
The Earl of Crewe 483
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 491
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 496

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion."

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 142 ; Not-Contents, 47.

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 509

House adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. TUESDAY, 2ND AUGUST, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Felixtowe Gas Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; South Shields Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 505

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [LORDS] (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 506

King's College Hospital Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 506

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [LORDS].—Verbal Amendments made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments .. 506

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [LORDS]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 506

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [LORDS] (KING'S CONSENT, ON BEHALF OF THE CROWN AND DUCHY OF LANCASTER, SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 506

North Wales Electric Power Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed with Amendments 507

West Riding Tramways Bill [LORDS] (KING'S CONSENT, ON BEHALF OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER, SIGNIFIED). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 507

Bristol Corporation Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 507

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered, to be read the third time 507

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—As amended, to be considered upon Thursday 507

Trafford Park Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 507

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 507

Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 507

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 507

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 507

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill.—As amended, considered; a clause added; Bill to be read the third time To-morrow .. 507

Glasgow and South Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill; Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Thursday .. 507

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No, 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Great Western Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to County Courts." [County Courts Bill [Lords.] 507

Aug. 2.]

Page

PETITIONS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 508

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petition from New Basford, for removal of prohibition; to lie upon the Table .. 508

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Aberdare; East Manchester (twenty-one); Nottingham; Warwick; and Welham Bridge; to lie upon the Table 508

PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table .. 508

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.—Petition from Bath, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table .. 508

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVAL BOILERS.—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee on Naval Boilers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 508

ARMY.—Copy presented, of Statement showing the Financial effect of certain reductions in, and additions to, the Army, proposed by the Secretary of State for War [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 508

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3243 to 3245 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. .. 509

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.—Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. Vol. II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. .. 509

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Sixteenth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 509

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the Law relating to Compensation for Injuries to Workmen. Vol. I., Report and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. .. 509

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT, 1903-4.—Return presented, relative thereto (ordered 14th July; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed, [No. 298.] .. 509

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.—Copy presented, of Forty-eighth Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 509

SHIPPING CASUALTIES (1902-3).—Copy presented, of Abstract of the Returns of Shipping Casualties which occurred on or near the Coasts or in Rivers and Harbours of the United Kingdom from the 1st July, 1902, to 30th June, 1903, and of the Returns of Shipping Casualties to British Vessels elsewhere than on the Coasts of the United Kingdom, and to Foreign Vessels on or near the Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours, of British Possessions Abroad, etc., with Charts and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 510

Page

ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER No. 10.—Return ordered, "of Motions for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 10, showing the date of such Motion, the name of the Member proposing, the definite matter of urgent public importance, and the result of any Division taken thereon during Session 1904 (in the same form as, and in continuation of, Parliamentary Paper, No. 318, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 510

CLOSURE OF DEBATE (STANDING ORDER No. 26).—Return ordered, "respecting application of Standing Order No. 26 (Closure of Debate) during Session 1904, under the following heads :—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6	7.
Date when Closure moved.	By whom moved.	Question before House or Committee when moved.	Whether in House or Committee.	Whether assent given to Motion or withheld by Speaker or Chairman.	Assent withheld because, in the opinion of the Chair, a decision would shortly be arrived at without that Motion.	Result of Motion, and, if a Division, Numbers for and against.

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 319, of Session 1903).—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 510

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.—Return ordered, "of the number of Divisions of the House in Session 1904; stating the subject of the Division, and the number of Members in the majority and minority. Tellers included; also the aggregate number in the House on each Division; distinguishing the Divisions on Public Business from Private; and also the number of Divisions before and after midnight (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.202, of Session 1903."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 510

PUBLIC BILLS.—Return ordered, "of the number of Public Bills, distinguishing Government from other Bills, introduced into this House, or brought from the House of Lords, during Session 1904; showing the number which received the Royal Assent; the number which were passed by this House, but not by the House of Lords; the number passed by the House of Lords, but not by this House; and distinguishing the stages at which such Bills as did not receive the Royal Assent were dropped or postponed and rejected in either House of Parliament (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.201, of Session 1903).—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 511

PUBLIC PETITIONS.—Return ordered, "of the number of Public Petitions presented and printed in Session 1904; with the total number of signatures in that year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.200, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 511

SELECT COMMITTEES.—Return ordered, "of the number of Select Committees appointed in Session 1904, including the Standing Committees and the Court of Referees; the subjects of inquiry; the names of the Members appointed to serve on each, and of the Chairman of each; the number of days each Committee met, and the number of days each Member attended; the total expense of the attendance of witnesses at each Select Committee, and the name of the Member who moved for such Select Committee; also the total number of Members who served on Select Committees (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.198, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) .. 511

Aug. 2.] Page

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.—Return ordered, "of the number of days on which the House sat in Session 1904, stating for each day the date of the month and day of the week, the hour of the meeting, and the hour of adjournment; and the total number of hours occupied in the Sittings of the House, and the average time; and showing the number of hours on which the House sat each day, and the number of hours after midnight, and the number of entries in each day's Votes and Proceedings (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.199, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 511

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (DAYS OCCUPIED BY GOVERNMENT AND BY PRIVATE MEMBERS).—Return ordered, "showing, with reference to Session 1904, (1) the number of Sittings at which, in accordance with the Standing Orders, Government Business had precedence; (2) the number of Evening Sittings on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and the number of Sittings on Fridays at which Private Members had precedence under the Standing Orders; (3) the number of Sittings at which Government Business had precedence under a special order of the House; (4) the number of Saturday Sittings; (5) the total number of Sittings at which Government Business had precedence; (6) the total number of days on which the House sat; (7) the total number of Motions for adjournment of the House on a matter of urgent public importance; and (8) the number of days on which Business of Supply was considered (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 320, of Session 1903)." —(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 512

PRIVATE BILLS AND PRIVATE BUSINESS.—Return ordered, "of the number of Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders introduced into the House of Commons and brought from the House of Lords, and of Acts passed in Session 1904, classed accordingly to the following subjects:—Railways; Tramways; Tramroads; Subways; Canals and Navigations; Roads and Bridges; Water; Waterworks; Gas; Gas and Water; Lighting and Improvement; Police and Sanitary Regulations; Corporations etc. (not relating to Police and Sanitary Regulations or to Lighting and Improvement Schemes); Ports, Piers, Harbours, and Docks; Churches, Chapels, and Burying Grounds; Markets and Fairs; Gaols and other County Buildings; Inclosure and Drainage; Estate; Divorce; Naturalisation; Hospitals, and Miscellaneous."

"Of all the Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders which in Session 1904 have been reported on by Committee on Opposed Private Bills or by Committees nominated partly by the House and partly by the Committee of Selection, together with the names of the selected Members who served on each Committee; the first and also the last day of the sitting of each Committee; the number of days on which each Committee sat; the number of days on which each selected Member has served; the number of days occupied by each Bill in Committee; the Bills the Preambles of which were reported to have been proved; the Bills the Preambles of which were reported to have been not proved; and, in the case of Bills for confirming Provisional Orders, whether the Provisional Orders ought or ought not to be confirmed."

"Of all Private Bills and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders which, in Session 1904 have been referred by the Committee of Selection, or by the General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills, to the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, together with the names of the Members who served on each Committee; the number of days on which each Committee sat; and the number of days on which each Member attended."

Aug. 2.] *Page*

"And, of the number of Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders withdrawn or not proceeded with by the parties, those Bills being specified which have been referred to Committees and dropped during the sittings of the Committee (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.197, of Session 1903.)"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 512

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ACCIDENT ON H.M.S. "BLAKE"—HEROISM OF CHIEF STOKER GEE—OFFICIAL RECOGNITION.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 513

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK BOOKS SENT IN FOR ANNUAL EXAMINATION.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord Stanley 514

FEE FOR LETTERS ADDRESSED TO TAIN POST OFFICE "TO BE CALLED FOR."—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Stanley 514

RETIRING ALLOWANCE FOR MRS. F. WILLIAMS, LATE OF EDGEWORTHSTOWN POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 515

VACANCY IN TELEGRAPH SUPERINTENDENT'S SURVEY BRANCH AT LEEDS.—Question, Mr. Barran (Leeds, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 515

DEATH RATE AND INFANT MORTALITY IN LONDON AND PROVINCIAL UNIONS.—Question, Mr. Barran (Leeds, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 515

SCHEMES FOR CREATION OF COUNTY BOROUGHS—POWERS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD TO AWARD COSTS.—Question, Mr. Duncan (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 516

EXTENSION OF CROFTER'S ACT TO SMALL CROFTER LEASEHOLDERS IN THE HIGHLANDS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 516

RETURN OF HOURS OF RAILWAY SERVANTS.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 517

PERCENTAGE OF NON-EMPLOYMENT IN THE PRINCIPAL INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES.—Question, Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour .. 517

INCREASE IN VIVISECTION EXPERIMENTS.—Question, Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 517

ADVERTISING OF PATENT MEDICINES.—Question, Mr. Tankerville Chamberlayne (Southampton); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 518

ANKYLOSTOMIA INFECTION—RECOMMENDATIONS OF DR. BOYCOTT.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 519

ACCIDENTS IN MINES—RESPONSIBILITY OF OWNERS AND MANAGERS.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 519

INDIAN VILLAGE POLICE.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 520

Aug. 2.]

Page

SALARY OF TEACHER OF SCHOOL ROLL NO. 8145.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 520

PROMOTION OF IRISH MALE PRINCIPAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 520

GOLD COMMANDEERED BY LATE SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC—CLAIM OF BRITISH BANKS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 521

TRADE DISPUTES COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 521

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

BOILER COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 522

MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS—COST OF COMPULSORY TRAINING.—Question, Colonel Llwellyn (Somersetshire, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 523

SOUTH AFRICAN MILITARY STORES SCANDAL.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 523

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR SOUTH AFRICAN COLONIES.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs), Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.), Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) and The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour. Manchester, E.) 524

FACTORY ACT REGULATIONS FOR DOCKS.—Questions, Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 527

DENBIGHSHIRE BURIAL DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 528

SLAUGHTER OF ANIMALS.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 528

JURY CHALLENGING AT CORK ASSIZES.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.) and Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 529

IRISH LUNATIC ASYLUMS—MARRIED ASSISTANT MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 530

IRISH ASSISTANT TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 530

KING HARMAN ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 531

King Harman Estate—Case of Wm. H. Plant, of Toome.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 531

Irish Government—Correspondence Regulations.—Question, Mr. Gretton (Derbyshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 531

Conveyance of Horses to Cork Show.—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 532

Kerry Evicted Tenants—Payments by Congested Districts Board.—Question, Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 532

Doohoma National School—Alleged Ill-treatment of Children.—Question, Colonel Saunderson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 533

Trinity College—Receipts under the Irish Church Act.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 533

Bennett Estate, King's County.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 535

King's County Appeals.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 535

The Drainage of the Barrow.—Questions, Mr. Delany; Answers, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 535

Ireland's Contribution to the British Exchequer.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 536

Interference with British Shipping—The "Knight Commander."—Question, Mr. Hoult (Cheshire, Wirrall); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 537

Army Re-organisation — Parliamentary Discussion. — Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 538

The Judge Advocate-General.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 539

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 539

Whitstable Education Foundation.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 540

Post Office Sites Bill—Questions of Order.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 540

Foreign Ships (Application of Statutory Powers) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence [Inquiry not completed.]

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 299.] 541

Dean Forest Bill.—Lord's Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to 541

Aug. 2.] *Page*

County Courts Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 291.] 541

Business of the House (Government Business)—Suspension of the Twelve O'clock Rule.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 541

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted, except at half-past Seven of the clock at an Afternoon Sitting, under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 548
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 550
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 553
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 555
Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) 559
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 561
Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S.W.) 564
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 565
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 566
Sir Joseph Dimsdale (London) 567
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 569
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 575
Mr. A. J. Balfour 578
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 582
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 585

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'except,' to insert the words 'on Fridays and.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 587
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 587
Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory) 587
Mr. Moss (Denbighshire, E.) 587
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 588
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) 588

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 208. (Division List No. 291.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 591

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 212 ; Noes, 134. (Division List No. 292.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 216 ; Noes, 128. (Division List No. 293.)

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted, except at half-past seven of the clock at an Afternoon Sitting, under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed ; and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,960, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Expenses in respect of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in the Department of His Majesty's Treasury."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 602
Sir A. Hayter (*Walsall*) 603
Sir John Colomb (*Great Yarmouth*) 604

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,960, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day,

of March, 1905, for the Expenses in respect of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in the Department of His Majesty's Treasury."

Sir John Colomb 605
Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 608
Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 611
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 614
Mr. A. J. Balfour 617
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 622
Colonel Blundell (Lancashire, Ince) 629
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 629
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 633
Captain Jessel (St. Pancras, S.) 635
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 637
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 638
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 640

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,860, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 640
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 641
Mr. Winston Churchill 641
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 642
Mr. Labouchere 643
Sir Edward Grey 643
Mr. Winston Churchill 644
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 645

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 48 ; Noes, 149. (Division List No. 294.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 133 ; Noes, 59. (Division List No. 295.)

Question put accordingly, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,960, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Expenses in respect of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in the Department of His Majesty's Treasury," and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Friday ; Committee to sit again this day.

Capital Expenditure (Money).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Aug. 2.] *Page*

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.*) 64

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That it is expedient to authorise the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sums which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament."—(*Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Sir Edward Grey (*Northumberland, Berwick*) 651

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Chairman do report Progress ; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Edward Grey.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 651
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 652
Mr. Buchanan (*Perthshire, E.*) 652
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 653
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 653
Sir Edward Grey 655
Mr. A. J. Balfour 656
Mr. A. J. Balfour 657
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 657
Mr. Runciman 658
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 658

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 127 ; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 296.)

Question put accordingly, " That the Chairman do report Progress ; and ask leave to sit again."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 53 ; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 297.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Buchanan 663
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 663
Mr. Lyell (*Dorsetshire, E.*) 664
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 664
Mr. Runciman 665
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) 666
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 666
Mr. Toulmin (*Lancashire, Bury*) 667

Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER rose in his place, and claimed to move " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 122 ; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 298.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 123 ; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 299.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sums which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report this Resolution to the House.'

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 123 ; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 300.)

Resolution to be reported this day.

CUNARD AGREEMENT [MONEY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 673

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the issue out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding in the whole £2,600,000, as are required for making the Advances to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited) under an Agreement with that Company, dated 30th July, 1903, and approved by the House of Commons 12th August, 1903, to authorise the Treasury to borrow money, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for the issue of such sums or the repayment thereof, the principal of and interest on such bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make other provisions relating to the said agreement."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Mr. William Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) 674

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. William Jones.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 675
Sir Edward Grey 675
Mr. A. J. Balfour 678
Mr. Lloyd-George 678
Mr. Runciman 680
Mr. Winston Churchill 683

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 123 ; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 301.)

Question put accordingly, " That the Chairman do report Progress ; and ask leave to sit again."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 52 ; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 302.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Runciman 687
Mr. Winston Churchill 691
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) 693
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) .. 694
Mr. Lloyd-George 696

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided : Ayes, 121 ; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 303.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided : Ayes, 121 ; Noes, 42. (Division List No. 304.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the issue out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding in the whole £2,600,000, as are required for making the Advances to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited), under an Agreement with that Company, dated 30th July, 1903, and approved by the House of Commons 12th August, 1903, to authorise the Treasury to borrow money, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for the issue of such sums or the repayment thereof, the principal of and interest on such bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make other provisions relating to the said agreement.

Question put, " That the Chairman do report this Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided : Ayes, 121 ; Noes, 42. (Division List No. 305.)

Resolution to be reported this day.

Whereupon in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Six of the clock a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : WEDNESDAY, 3RD AUGUST, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London and India Docks Company Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 705

Aug. 3.] *Page*

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 705

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 705

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 705

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 705

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table .. ..

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 705

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 705

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 705

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 706

Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power-Gas Bill [Lords]; Belfast Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 706

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Beaufort; Blaina; Brynmawr; Ebbw Vale; Manchester (two); Nantyglo; Nosterfield; Victoria (Mon.); Waun Llwyd; and West Tanfield; to lie upon the Table 706

Prevention of Corruption Bill.—Petition from Kettering, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. ..

Vaccination Acts.—Petition from Derby, for repeal; to lie upon the Table .. 706

Aug. 3.]

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT (No. 2) 1904.—Copy presented, of despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul General at Cairo, enclosing a Report by Sir William Garstin, G.C.M.G., Under-Secretary of State for Public Works in Egypt, upon the Basin of the Upper Nile [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 706

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, 1903-4.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th July; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 300.] 706

CHANNEL ISLANDS (CROWN RIGHTS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th March; *Sir Charles Dilke*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 301.] 706

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 422 (Gibraltar, Annual Report for 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 707

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Adjournment Motions under Standing Order No. 10. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed. [No. 302.]

Closure of Debate (Standing Order No. 26). Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed. [No. 303.]

Divisions of the House. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Public Bills. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Public Petitions. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Select Committees. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Sittings of the House. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Business of the House (Days occupied by Government and by private Members). Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed. [No. 304.]

Private Bills and Private Business. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.. 707

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES, 1903.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the production and consumption of Alcoholic Beverages (Wine, Beer, and Spirits) in the various Countries of Europe, in the United States, and in the principal British Colonies; and the Revenue derived therefrom in recent years (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 335, of Session 1901)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) 707

Aug. 3.] Page

London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894 (Accounts under Section 1 (7) of the Act).—Return ordered, " showing, according to the accounts for the twelve months preceding the 31st day of March, 1904, furnished to the Local Government Board under Section 1 (7) of the London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894—

(1) The amounts paid during the year out of the Equalisation Fund under the Act to the Corporation of the City of London and each of the Councils of the Metropolitan Boroughs to whom payments out of that fund were made.

(2) The amount of the expenses incurred during the year by each of these authorities (a) under The Public Health (London) Act, 1891. (including expenses of scavenging streets); (b) in respect of lighting; and (c) in respect of streets (other than the expenses of scavenging); and

(3) The amount expended during the year by each such authority out of the sums received by them under the Act (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 338, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Grant Lawson*) 708

Civil Servants (Retirement at the Age of Sixty-five).—Copy ordered, " of Treasury Minute, dated the 30th day of July, 1904, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of sixty-five; and of the Return therein referred to."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish*) 708

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899.—Return ordered, " of all the Draft Provisional Orders under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which in the Session of 1904 have been reported on by the Commissioners; together with the names of the Commissioners; the first and also the last day of the sittings in each group; the number of days on which each body of Commissioners sat; the number of days on which each Commissioner has served; the number of days occupied by each Draft Provisional Order before the Commissioners; the Draft Provisional Orders, the Preambles of which were reported to have been proved; and the Draft Provisional Orders, the Preambles of which were reported to have been not proved."—(*The Lord Advocate.*) 708

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Penalties for Illegal Trawling.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray.. 709

H.M.S. " Jackal " and Protection of Scotch Fisheries.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray.. 709

Durness Medical Case.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray.. 709

Closing of Dilapidated China and Earthenware Factories.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 710

Revenue derived from Special Delivery of Letters on Public Holidays. Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Stanley 711

Aug. 3.]

Page

ALLEGED CARELESSNESS IN AFFIXING POSTMARKS.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Lord Stanley 711

MEMORIAL OF LONDON SORTER TRACERS.—Question, Sir Henry Kimber (Wandsworth); Answer, Lord Stanley 711

PHYSICAL DEGENERATION—INQUIRY INTO PURITY OF MANUFACTURED OR PREPARED FOODS.—Question, Mr. Round (Essex, Harwich); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 712

FOODSTUFFS AS CONTRABAND OF WAR—CORRESPONDENCE WITH LATE BOER GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 712

APPOINTMENT OF BRITISH OFFICERS TO THE EGYPTIAN ARMY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Percy 712

LIFE-SAVING APPLIANCES ON FOREIGN SHIPS PLYING BETWEEN BRITISH AND CONTINENTAL PORTS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 713

EDUCATION CODE—EXTRANEOUS DUTIES CLAUSES.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Sir William Anson 713

PROPOSED SOUTH AFRICAN WAR MEMORIAL.—Question, Sir E. Durning-Lawrence (Cornwall, Truro); Answer, Lord Balcarres 714

PAY OF RIDING-MASTERS AND QUARTERMASTERS OF THE BRITISH ARMY SERVING IN INDIA.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 714

EXTENSION OF A SIX-DAY LICENCE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 715

POLICE AND PARTY EMBLEMS IN ARMAGH.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 715

TOWNLANDS BETWEEN MOY AND TREW STATIONS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 716

ESSEX FARMERS AND COLCHESTER CAMP STRAW CONTRACTS.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 716

THE NEW ARMY SCHEME.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 716

CHARTERED COMPANY AND THE FUTURE GOVERNMENT OF RHODESIA.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 717

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

EGYPTIAN FINANCE —THE CAISSE DE LA DETTE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 718

PROTECTION OF MECCA PILGRIMS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Earl Percy .. 718

Aug. 3.] Page

THE TRANSVAAL—GOLD GOODS BY PARCEL POST.—Question, Mr. William McKillop (Sligo, N.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 718

TAIN (ROSS-SHIRE) POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Stanley 719

WRONGFUL CONVICTION—COMPENSATION FOR ADOLF BECK.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 719

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION—COMMITTEE'S SUGGESTIONS ON VENTILATION AND CHILD-REARING.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 720

TRAWLING IN BELFAST LOUGH.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) .. 720

MOTOR-CAR SCHEME FOR DERRY.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin and Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 721

PORTADOWN DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 722

EAST LIMERICK RENT APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 722

RE-INSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS IN LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 723

KING HARMAN ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. Blake (Longford, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 723

CASE OF CONSTABLE ANDERSON, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.), Mr. Joseph Devlin, and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 724

RATE OF INTEREST ON LOANS FOR LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 725

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD SURCHARGES.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 726

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY RECRUITS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 726

MACROOM UNION CLERKSHIP.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 727

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN IRELAND—UNQUALIFIED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 727

CONSTABLE ANDERSON.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 727

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK—ART EXAMINATION.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 728

Aug. 3.]

Page

South Dublin County Police.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 728

Irish Assistant School Teachers.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 729

Lord Dunraven's Limerick Estates.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 729

Queen's College, Cork—Art Course Examination Failures.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 729

Queen's College, Cork—Students and Royal University Art Examinations.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham .. 730

Portavogie Harbour Works.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 730

Belfast Post Office.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, Lord Stanley 731

Dublin Sorting Office—The Corcoran Case.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Lord Stanley 732

Belfast Post Office—Payment of Telegraph Messengers.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Lord Stanley 733

The Scottish Free Church Judgment.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 733

Business of the House.—Questions, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.), Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Lloyd George (Carnarvon Boroughs), Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Mr. Nannetti; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour and Lord Stanley 735

Workmen's Trains.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read. [Inquiry not completed.] Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 305.] 736

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,371, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums:"

Colonel Saunderson (*Armagh, N.*) 736

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum not exceeding £14,271, be granted for the said service.—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Mr. Joseph Devlin (*Kilkenny, N.*) 745
Mr. William Moore (*Antrim, N.*) 750
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 759
Mr. Sloan (*Belfast, S.*) 770
Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 772
Mr. Gordon (*Londonderry, S.*) 774
Mr. T. L. Corbett (*Down, N.*) 776
Sir J. Fergusson (*Manchester, NE.*) 776
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 777
Mr. Lonsdale 779
Mr. Wyndham 783
Mr. Hemphill (*Tyrone, N.*) 787
Sir James Haslett (*Belfast, N.*) 787

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS IV.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,300, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for a Grant in Aid of the Expenses of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland."

Mr. Clancy (*Dublin County, N.*).. 788

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £2,200, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Clancy.*)

Mr. Gordon (*Londonderry, S.*) 792
Mr. Swift (*MacNeill* (*Donegal, S.*) 795
Colonel Nolan (*Galway, N.*) 797
Mr. Wolff Belfast, E.) 798

Page
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 799
Mr. Wyndham 802
Mr. John Redmond 805

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (MONEY).

Resolution reported.—

"That it is expedient to authorise the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sums which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament."

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 808

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'sums,' to insert the words 'not exceeding in the aggregate £6,250,000.' "—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 809
Sir M. Hicks Beach (Bristol, W.) 811
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 812
Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 813
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 815
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 817
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 822

Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 132; Noes, 48. (Division List No. 306.)

Question put acordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 48; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 307.)

Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided :—Ayes, 130; Noes, 45. (Division List No. 308.)

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill.—"To enable the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for purposes for which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities;" presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 292.]

CUNARD AGREEMENT [MONEY].

Resolution reported.

"That it is expedient to authorise the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding in the whole £2,600,000, as are required for making the Advances to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited), under an Agreement with that Company, dated 30th July, 1903, and approved by the House of Commons 12th August, 1903, to authorise the Treasury to borrow money, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for the issue of such sums or the repayment thereof, the principal of and interest on such bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make other provisions relating to the said Agreement."

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 830
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 830
Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.) 831
Sir James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street) 833
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 833
Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 834
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds Central) 836

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Mr. Gerald Balfour, and Mr. Pretyman.

Cunard Agreement (Money) Bill.—"To make provision with respect to an advance to be made to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited), under an Agreement with that Company, dated the thirtieth day of July, nineteen hundred and three," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 293.]

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at four minutes after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS THURSDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1904.

NEW PEER.

The LORD BELLEW took the Oath. 837

SAT FIRST.

The LORD MINSTER (*M. Conyngham*)—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 837

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 837

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 837

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 837

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons 837

Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to 837

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.];—Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment to each Bill. The said Amendments to be considered To-morrow. 837

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.];—King's College Hospital Bill [H.L.]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Ship Canal Bill [H.L.]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 837

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 838

Felixstowe Gas Bill.—Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; South Shields Gas Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 838

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*), and reported from the Committee. [No. 179.] 838

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.. 838

Aug. 4.] *Page*

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 838

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 838

Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill.—Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed 838

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; of "George Bird" Lodge of Good Templars; Western Temperance League; and Inhabitants of Doncaster; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 838

LICENSING BILL.—Petition for Amendment of; of residents in New Windsor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 838

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill (HOUSE OF COMMONS).—Message to the Commons for Reports, etc., of the Select Committee 839

EGYPT, No. 2 (1904).—Despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General at Cairo, enclosing a report by Sir William Garstin, G.C.M.G., Under-Secretary of State for Public Works in Egypt, upon the Basin of the Upper Nile 839

COLONIES (ANNUAL).—

No. 422. Gibraltar (Report for 1903). Local Government Board. Thirty-second Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1902–1903. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer for 1902–3. Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903–4.

Army. (Army Reserve)—Further regulations relating to the Army Reserve; (Militia)—further regulations relating to the Militia 839

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURT JURISDICTION IN MIDDLESEX.—Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State to inquire into the question of metropolitan police court jurisdiction in Middlesex; with evidence. 839

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND), 1903. Part I. Criminal statistics 839

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Return of evictions in Ireland, for the quarter ended 30th June, 1904 839

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Return of all British ships ordered by the Board of Trade or its officers, during the period from 1st July, 1903, to 30th June, 1904, to be provisionally detained as unsafe by reason of the defective condition of their hulls, equipments, or machinery, or by reason of overloading or improper loading, etc.; also of all foreign ships ordered to be provisionally detained during the same period as unsafe by reason of overloading or improper loading; together with summaries showing respectively the total number of ships ordered to be detained as unsafe, from 1st July, 1903, to 30th June, 1904, and since the 1st October, 1876 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 1715.].

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 839

BANKRUPTCY.—Twenty-first General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 840

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).—Thirteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 840

Electric Lighting (London) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow. 840

County of Suffolk Bill.—Committed for Monday next 840

Wild Birds Protection Acts Amendment (St. Kilda) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 840

Army Council Bill.—Moved, "That the House do go into Committee on this Bill."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Earl Spencer 840
The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 841

House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1 :—

The Marquess of Ripon 841
The Earl of Donoughmore 842
Lord Monkswell 843

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

The Marquess of Ripon 843

Clause 2 agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to: Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

University of Liverpool Bill.—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Commitee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 844

Leeds University Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Marquess of Ripon 844

Aug 4.] *Page*

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Ripon.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committeed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Whale Fisheries (Scotland Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Kintore 844

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committee to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Licensing Bill.—House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1 :—

Lord Coleridge 848

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'licence' to insert the words 'other than a licence, the holder of which is under an agreement to purchase any of the commodities or goods which he sells or uses from or to deal with any particular person, firm, corporation, or company.'"——(*Lord Coleridge.*)

Lord Belper 851
Earl Spencer 854
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 855
The Lord Bishop of Chester 855
The Marquess of Ripon 857
Viscount Peel 858
Lord Coleridge 859

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

The Earl of Wemyss 859

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out from the first word 'or' to the first word 'or' in line 8, and insert the words 'that the applicant has failed to comply with an order for structural alteration under Section 11, Sub-section (4), of the Licensing Act, 1902.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 859

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 7, after the second word 'or' to insert the word 'structurally.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 861
The Marquess of Salisbury 861
Lord Stanley of Alderley 862
The Marquess of Huntly 862

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 124 ; Not-Contents, 38.

Lord Stanley of Alderley 863

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, lines 11 and 12, to leave out the words 'on a reference from those justices and' "—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*The Earl of Onslow*) 865
Lord Burghclere 866
Lord Belper 867
Lord Bishop of Hereford 868
The Marquess of Salisbury 868
The Marquess of Ripon 869
The Earl of Carlisle 870
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans 870
The Earl of Onslow 870

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Lord Kinnaird 871

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out the words 'may if they think expedient' and to insert the word 'shall'; and in lines 26 and 27, to leave out the words 'unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary.' " —(*Lord Kinnaird.*)

Lord Belper 871
Lord Stanley of Alderley 872
The Marquess of Salisbury 872

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Lord Stanley of Alderley 873

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 28, after the word 'renewal' to insert the words 'or refusal.' "—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

The Earl of Onslow 874

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Coleridge 874

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2 line 1, after the word 'premises to insert the words, 'and the justices.' "—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 875
Lord Stanley of Alderley 875
Lord Coleridge 876
The Marquess of Salisbury 876

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 876

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 1, to insert the following clause, 'After the end of fourteen years from the passing of this Act existing on-licences shall not be renewed, but in place of every existing on-licence which is still in existence after the end of such period there shall be granted at the next ensuing general annual licensing meeting a new licence for the term of seven years, subject to the provisions of Section 4 of this Act, but without the imposition of any payment or conditions under Sub-section (2) of such section other than the conditions (if any) attached to the existing licence. Provided, nevertheless, that such licence may be refused on the same grounds and subject to the same terms and conditions as the renewal of the existing licence might have been refused.' "—(*The Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 885
The Marquess of Ripon 890
The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells 894
Lord Zouche of Haryngworth 897
Lord Stanley of Alderley 900
Viscount Cross 903
The Earl of Rosebery 905
The Earl of Onslow 909
Viscount Peel 912
The Lord Bishop of Ripon 913
The Earl of Lytton 916
Earl Spencer 918
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 920
Earl Grey 924

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 52 ; Not Contents, 126.

Clause 2 :—

The Earl of Wemyss 925

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 5 and 6, to leave out the words, 'value of the licensed premises,' and insert the words, 'market value of the premises as licensed premises.' "—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

Lord Belper 927
Lord Burghclere 927
The Marquess of Salisbury 927

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Lord Stanley of Alderley 927

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 5, to leave out from the second word 'the' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'rateable value of the licensed premises and the rateable value of the same premises would bear if not licensed at the time of the passing of this Act, capitalised at such sum not exceeding ten years purchase of such excess value as the Court of quarter sessions or their committee or in a county borough the licensing authority, shall think reasonable to be distributed between the licensed holder and other persons interested in the licence as the licensing authority shall think equitable. Provided that if a person interested in licensed premises is dissatisfied with such rateable value as giving a true measure of the yearly value of the licensed premises, he may within three months of the passing of this Act declare what in his opinion was the true annual value before the passing of this Act of the said licensed premises, and the quarter sessions or their committee, or in a county borough the licensing authority, shall consider and determine what was the true annual value, and the value so determined shall be the value on the basis of which compensation shall be awarded.'"

The Marquess of Salisbury 932
Lord Stanley of Alderley 935
The Marquess of Ripon 936
The Earl of Onslow 936

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," resolved in the affirmative.

Earl Grey 937

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 6 and 7, to leave cut the words, 'calculated as if the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were applicable.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

The Earl of Aberdeen 940
The Marquess of Salisbury 940
The Earl of Camperdown 942
The Earl of Crewe 943
Earl Carrington 943
The Marquess of Lansdowne 944
Lord Coleridge 944
Earl Spencer 945
The Marquess of Salisbury 946
Earl Beauchamp 946

Moved, "That the House be resumed."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 37 ; Not-Contents, 85.

On Question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause" their Lordships divided :—Contents, 83 ; Not-Contents, 38.

House resumed, and to be again in Committee to-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES.—Report of the Select Committee made ; to be printed ; and to be considered on Tuesday next. (No. 180.)

House adjourned at five minutes before One o'clock to half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill.—Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to 950

Ilford Urban District Council Bill [LORDS]. (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 950

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [LORDS]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 956

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 951

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 951

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER). As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 951

Glasgow and South Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill; Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed 951

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [LORDS]. — Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords]. Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment. 951

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].— Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time to-morrow .. 951

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill [LORDS.]—Order [18th July], That the Bill be read the third time, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 951

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 3) Bill [LORDS]. —Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow 951

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Selby Urban District Council Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to Amendments to—Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; Lothians Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make provision for the transfer of property and other matters consequent upon the dissolution of districts and Poor Law Unions, or the addition of one Poor Law Union to another." [Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Aberdeen City Improvement.' [Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.] 951

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill. [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [No. 294.] 952

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill. [Lords].—To be considered to-morrow 952

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Arlesey; Llanrhyddbad; Polton; and West Harton; to lie upon the Table 952

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Local Government Board.—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-second Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1902-3, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 952

Local Government Board.—Copy presented, of Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903-4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 952

Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1904-5.–Copy presented, of Revised Estimate, Class 7, Vote 5 (Ireland Development Grant) [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 307.] 953

Public Revenue and Expenditure (Royal Navy).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th May; *Sir John Colomb*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 308.] 953

Civil Servants (Retirement at the Age of Sixty-Five).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd August; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 309.] 953

Public Works Loans Bill.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st August; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 306.] 953

Army (Militia).—Copy presented, of further Regulations relating to the Militia [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 953

Aug. 4.] *Page*

ARMY RESERVE.—Copy presented, of Further Regulations relating to the Army Reserve [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 953

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURT JURISDICTION (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the question of Metropolitan Police Court Jurisdiction in Middlesex, with Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 953

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894 (VESSELS DETAINED).—Copy presented, of Return of all ships ordered by the Board of Trade, or its officers, during the period from the 1st July, 1903, to the 30th June, 1904, to be provisionally detained as unsafe, together with Summaries, etc. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 953

TRAMWAYS AND LIGHT RAILWAYS (STREET AND ROAD).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd July; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 310.] 954

COMPANIES (WINDING UP).—Copy presented, of Thirteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 311.] 954

BANKRUPTCY.—Copy presented, of Twenty-first General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 312.] 954

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1903. Part I. Criminal Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 954

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th June, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 954

POST OFFICE (EAST INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIA MAILS).—Copy ordered, "of Contract, dated the 25th day of July, 1904, between the Postmaster-General and the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company for the conveyance of the East India, China, and Australia Mails, being supplemental to the Contract dated the 25th day of May, 1897 (H.C. No. 259, of Session 1897); together with copy of Treasury Minute thereon, dated the 2nd day of August, 1904."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) 954

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

DISPLAY OF PARTY EMBLEMS ON LICENSED PREMISES IN IRELAND.—Question Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 954

DISTURBANCES AT MILFORD.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 955

RATE OF INTEREST ON LOANS FOR ERECTION OF LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN IRELAND.—MR. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 956

ISSUE OF UP-TO-DATE EDITION OF FISCAL BLUE-BOOK.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 957

DELAY IN CONSTRUCTION OF CROMORE-GRAVIR ROAD (ISLAND OF LEWIS).—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 957

SOLDIERS IN INDIA AND ELSEWHERE—EXTENSION OF SERVICE.—Question, Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) ; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 958

THE NEW EDITION OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.—Question, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) ; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 959

ORDER UNDER THE DOCKYARD PORTS REGULATION ACT AT PLYMOUTH.—Question, Mr. Duke (Plymouth) ; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 959

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—PROPORTION OF COST BORNE BY LOCAL AND IMPERIAL FUNDS.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Wharton (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) ; Answer, Sir William Anson 960

PRESERVATION AS AN ANCIENT MONUMENT OF ARDANDRA CASTLE (COUNTY LONGFORD).—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 961

ACHEEN WAR—SUGGESTED PACIFIC INTERVENTION OF GREAT BRITAIN.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury) ; Answer, Earl Percy 961

INCREASE OF RUSSIAN AND AUSTRIAN OFFICERS OF MACEDONIAN GENDARMERIE. Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ; Answer, Earl Percy 962

PREVENTION OF DECOMPOSITION OF MEAT DURING TRANSIT FROM ABROAD.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs) ; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 963

DEFECTIVE VENTILATION OF LOBBY TELEGRAPH OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) ; Answer, Lord Balcarres 963

PAINTING BY WATTS IN THE GRAND COMMITTEE ROOM.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) ; Answer, Lord Balcarres 964

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL SUB-INSPECTOR OF RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby) ; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 964

BUSINESS OF BANGOR, PORTRUSH AND BALLYMONEY POST OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) ; Answer, Lord Stanley 964

PAY OF ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell (Mayo, S.) ; Answer, Lord Stanley 965

FREE DELIVERY OF TELEGRAMS IN IRISH VILLAGES.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell ; Answer, Lord Stanley 966

DELIVERY OF LETTERS AT IRISHTOWN, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell ; Answer, Lord Stanley 966

MILITARY EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURED IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 967

VACANT SIEMSHIP OF CHERRA (ASSAM).—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 967

Aug. 4.] *Page*

REPORT OF THE INDIAN POLICE COMMISSION—PROPOSALS OF INDIAN GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 967

AGRICULTURAL BANKS IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick .. 968

RECOMMENDATIONS OF INDIAN IRRIGATION COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 968

DRAINAGE OF SCARIFF RIVER.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 968

COMMITTAL OF LUNATICS—FEES OF DROMORE PETTY SESSIONS CLERK.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 969

SALE OF THE MARQUESS OF ELY'S ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 969

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 970

WATER SUPPLY OF CROSSGAR, COUNTY DOWN.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 970

SALE TO TENANTS OF IRISH LAND.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 971

IRISH ESTATES—ENLARGEMENT OF TENANTS' HOLDINGS.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 972

OVERCROWDING ON THE BALLINROBE AND CLAREMORRIS RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 973

SALE OF LORD CLANMORRIS'S ESTATE—SURRENDER OF GRAZING RANCHES.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 973

GRAZING LAND ON THE ISADORE BURKE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 974

ARMY RE-ORGANISATION SCHEME.—Question, Sir A. Hayter (Walsall); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 974

EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.—Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 974

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

VISIT OF BRITISH WARSHIPS TO LERWICK.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 975

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 975

ILL-TREATMENT OF BOMA NATIVES—CASE OF M. DE TIEGE.—Question, Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 975

Aug. 4.] *Page*

SOUDAN CIVIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Earl Percy 976

CRETE—DR. JANUARIS' CASE.—Question, Captain Ellice (St. Andrew's Burghs); Answer, Earl Percy 976

OLD HORSES AS HUMAN FOOD.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, Earl Percy 977

THE NEW EAST.—Questions, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Earl Percy 977

VENEZUELAN TARIFFS.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Earl Percy 978

BANK OF IRELAND AND THE COUNTY TREASURY.—Questions, Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 979

SPIRIT PERMITS.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 980

RENT ALLOWANCES TO METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Questions, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 981

HOLLOWAY GAOL—CUTTING OF FEMALE PRISONERS' HAIR WHILE UNDER REMAND. Questions, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. Akers Douglas 982

THE FISCAL QUESTION—PREFERENTIAL TARIFFS AND RETALIATION.—Questions, Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 983

THE TELEGRAPH VOTE AND THE BRADFORD WAGES COMMITTEE REPORT.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 984

"SEASON TELEGRAPHISTS."—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 984

INSTRUCTION IN DOMESTIC ECONOMY FOR GIRLS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 985

VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 985

BANGOR (COUNTY DOWN) HARBOUR.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) and Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 987

VICTOR DE L'HERAULT'S ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 986

CUSACK ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 987

Aug. 4.] *Page*

THOMPSON ESTATE, NORTH LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 987

IRISH LAND ACT ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 987

FRENCH'S ESTATE, TIPPERARY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 988

BERESFORD ESTATE, COUNTY WATERFORD.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 988

BELFAST ANGLERS AND BALLYNAHINCH RIVER.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 989

NORTH DUBLIN GUARDIANS—CASE OF JOHN MORRIS.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 989

DUNGANNAN SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 990

COOKSTOWN DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Doogan (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 990

EARL FITZWILLIAM'S TENANTS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 991

FOX ESTATE, KING'S COUNTY—Question, Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 991

LANSDOWNE ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 992

GAME LICENCES IN IRELAND—COLEHILL GAME KEEPER'S CONDUCT.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 992

GLANQUIN EXTRA POLICE FORCE.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 993

NORTH KERRY ROD ANGLERS AND THE CLOSE SEASON.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 993

CASHEN (KERRY) SALMON FISHERY.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 994

LABOURERS' COTTAGES GRANT DISTRIBUTION.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 994

UNECONOMIC HOLDINGS AT ATHENRY.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 995

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, VETERINARY DEPARTMENT—CLERKS' GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 995

BANGOR (IRELAND) POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answer, Lord Stanley 996

Aug. 4.] *Page*

THE LATE MRS. HELEN BLAKE'S ESTATE.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) and the Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 996

EDGEWORTHSTOWN LOAN FUND SOCIETY FRAUDS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 997

IRISH ROYAL CANALS.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 997

SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC—COMMANDEERED SPECIE.—Questions, Mr. Sloan and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 998

FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 999

ST. KATHARINE'S HOSPITAL, REGENT'S PARK.—Questions, Mr. Cremer; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 999

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1000

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Whitley (Halifax) and Mr. Lough; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1001

NEW BILL.

Juvenile Smoking Bill.—"To provide for the Prevention of Juvenile Smoking," presented by Mr. Rigg; supported by Colonel Bain, Mr. Allen, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Lambert; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 3,295.] 1002

SUPPLY [20TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £104,094 be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department and Subordinate Offices."

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1002

Motion made and Question proposed, "That item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Secretary of State."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire) 1009
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1013
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 1016
Mr. John Burns (Battersea) 1020
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1025
Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent) 1029
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 1034
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 1036
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1038

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 101 ; Noes, 170. (Division List No. 309.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Atherley Jones (Durham, N.W.) 1049
Mr. Akers Douglas 1049
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 1050
Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford) 1050

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

The Chairman of Ways and Means.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means from this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

Supply [20th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Navy Estimates, 1904–5.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,314,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 1052
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1057
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) .. 1059

Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 1064
Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth) 1066
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1068

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,169,000, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Sir John Colomb 1072
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 1074
Mr. Pretyman 1075

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 50 ; Noes, 148. (Division List No. 310.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next ; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—[Second Reading.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 1079
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1081

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, and add the words, 'in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient that when important Acts of Parliament have been passed for a limited period, any of such Acts should be included in a general Bill for the continuance of Expiring Laws brought in at the close of the session without affording any fair opportunity of considering the propriety of their discontinuance or their modification.' "—(*Mr. Winston Churchill.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1082
Mr. Swift MacNeill 1082

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

Naval Prize Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1083

Aug. 4.] *Page*

Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill [LORDS].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn. 1083

Crown Lands Bill.—Order for Second Reading, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1083

ALIENS (EXPENSES).—Orders for receiving the Report thereupon read, and discharged 1083

Penal Servitude Bill.—Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd June], That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc., read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1083

Police Superannuation Bill.—Order for Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Solicitors Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Local Authorities (Treasury Powers) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Sale of Butter Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Lunacy Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Sea Fisheries Bill [LORDS].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Valuation Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1084

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiner that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5). The same was ordered the lie on the Table .. 1085

Loch Leven Water Power Bill.—Leyton Urban District Council Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons .. 1085

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1085

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order, and passed 1085

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next 1085

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment to be considered on Monday next 1085

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. —Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered on Monday next 1085

Ilford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1085

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1085

Glasgow and South-Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill (No. 181); Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill (No. 182). Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^a (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*), and reported from the Committee 1086

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendment to each Bill considered (according to order), and agreed to 1086

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee. Bills to be read 3^a on Monday next 1086

Aug. 5.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3.

The Duke of Northumberland 1086

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, to leave out Sub-section 1."—(*The Duke of Northumberland.*)

The Earl of Kintore 1088
The Duke of Northumberland 1090
Lord Glenesk 1090
The Acting Chairman of Committees (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) .. 1090
The Duke of Northumberland 1092
Lord Kenyon 1093
Earl Cawdor 1093

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," their Lordships divided—Contents, 38; Not-Contents, 46.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BRAZIL, No. 1 (1904).—Award of His Majesty the King of Italy with regard to the boundary between the Colony of British Guiana and the United States of Brazil 1095

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3246. France (Bastia).

No. 3247. Spain (Galicia, Asturias, and Leon) 1095

SEA FISHERIES.—Report of proceedings at the fourteenth annual meeting of representatives of authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, Thursday, 16th June, 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1095

Re-vaccination Bill. [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 1095

Electric Lighting (London) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 1095

University of Liverpool Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1095

Leeds University Bill; WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next .. 1095

NEW BREAKWATER AT MALTA.

Viscount Sidmouth 1095
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*The Earl of Selborne* 1096

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Earl Beauchamp 1096
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 1097

MACEDONIA.

Lord Newton 1097
Earl Spencer 1099
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1099

THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES.

Lord Coleridge 1101
The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough*) .. 1103
The Marquess of Ripon 1104

Post Office Bill. [SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (*The Marquess of Londonderry*) 1105

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Licensing Bill.—House again in Committee (according to order).

Clause 2.

The Earl of Camperdown 1105
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 1106
Earl Grey 1107

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 8, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and, in any case where the value of the licensed premises has been enhanced by the refusal to renew any other licence under this Act, as if the licence had not been so enhanced.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

Aug. 5.]

Page
The Marquess of Salisbury 1107
The Marquess of Ripon 1108
The Marquess of Salisbury 1109

Amendment, by leave of the Committee withdrawn.

Lord Coleridge 1110

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'deducting from the sum payable by way of compensation to each person or persons so interested as aforesaid respectively, any increased value attaching to any other licensed premises in which such person or persons are interested respectively, and accruing to such person or persons respectively, in consequence of the refusal to renew the licence.'"—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

Lord Stanley of Alderley 1111
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans 1111
The Earl of Crewe 1112
Lord Davey 1112
The Earl of Lytton 1113
The Marquess of Salisbury 1113
Lord Coleridge 1113
The Earl of Rosebery 1114

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

The Earl of Arran 1114

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word premises, to insert the words 'Provided always, that in estimating the value of the licensed premises, there shall not be included as an element of value the value of the exclusive right of supplying intoxicating liquors for sale on the licensed premises.'"—(*The Earl of Arran.*)

Lord Belper 1115
Lord Burghclere 1116
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*The Earl of Onslow*) 1117
The Earl of Camperdown 1117

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'but in calculating such compensation no account shall be taken of any profits arising from the manufacture, as distinct from the sale by retail, of intoxicating liquors, nor from the sale by wholesale of such liquors.'" —(*Lord Burghclere.*) .. ..

On Question, "That those words be there inserted,"

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 42 ; Not-Contents, 112.

Page

Lord Stanley of Alderley 1121

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word 'paid' to the word 'shall' in line 18.' "—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1121

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 1122

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 24, to leave out the first word 'the' and insert the word 'a.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

The Earl of Onslow 1122

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Earl Beauchamp 1123

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 24, after the first word 'licence' to insert the words 'and to the diminution in value consequent on the non-renewal of the licence of any trade fixtures or any other property owned by him and used for the purposes of his business as a licence-holder.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

The Earl of Onslow 1123
Lord Davey 1124

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1124

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'as' to insert the words 'a yearly'; and in lines 26 and 27, to leave out the words 'for a year or from year to year.' "—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

Lord Davey 1125
The Marquess of Salisbury 1125

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1125

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 29 and 30, to leave out the words 'should be referred to the determination of a' and insert the words 'can be more conveniently determined by the county.' " — (*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

Aug. 5.] Page

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Wemyss 1125

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 32, after the word 'purpose' to insert the words 'or may state a case for the consideration of the High Court.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 1126

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Earl Grey 1126

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 32, after the word 'purpose,' to insert as a new sub-section the words:

"(4.) For the purpose of calculating the value of licensed premises under this section, occupiers of all licensed premises to which this Act applies shall once in every month make a return to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue at such time and in such form as the Commissioners determine, showing the amount of alcoholic liquor sold on the premises during the preceding month."—(*Earl Grey.*)

The Earl of Carlisle 1127
The Marquess of Salisbury 1127

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn. .. .. ..

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3.

The Lord Bishop of London 1128

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 37, to leave out the words 'not exceeding and,' and in line 38, to leave out the word 'maximum.'"—(*The Lord Bishop of London.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1129
Earl Carrington 1132
Lord Monkswell 1133

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Earl Stanhope 1134

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'expenses' to insert the words 'and all necessary legal expenses.'"—(*Earl Stanhope.*)

Lord Belper 1135

Aug. 5.] *Page*

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

The Earl of Carlisle 1135

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 23, after the word 'fund' to insert the words 'and Section 20 of the Licensing Act, 1902, shall apply as though the consideration of a report of the justices of a licensing district were a case of appeal against their decision.'"—(*The Earl of Carlisle.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1137

On Question, Amendment negatived.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1137

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 27, after the word 'borrow' to insert the words 'for a period not exceeding seven years.'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

Lord Belper 1138
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1138
The Marquess of Salisbury 1139
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1139
Earl Spencer 1139

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1139

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 36, to leave out from the first word 'sessions' to the end of the sub-section."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 40, after the word 'new' to insert the word 'on.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Camperdown 1140

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 3, after the word 'follows' to insert the words '(a) No compensation shall be payable in the event of the renewal of a new licence being refused.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Aug. 5.] Page

Lord Belper 1141
The Earl of Camperdown 1142

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1143

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 5, after the word 'for' to insert the words 'suitable premises and.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 9, to leave out the word 'as' and insert the word 'when,' and to leave out the word 'premises.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Coleridge 1144

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 18, after the word 'value' to insert the words 'Provided that no new licence shall be granted until at least three weeks notice shall have been given to the local authority for the area in which such premises are situate, and the justices have considered all representations made by such local authority either in writing or at the hearing of the application in respect of such application.'"—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1144

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1145

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 19, to leave out the words from the beginning of the sub-section to the word 'for' in line 20, and insert the words 'The justices of a licensing district may, if they think fit, instead of granting a new on-licence as an annual licence, grant the licence.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

Lord Stanley of Alderley 1146
The Marquess of Salisbury 1146
Lord Shuttleworth 1146
The Marquess of Salisbury 1147
Lord Davey 1147
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1148
The Earl of Halsbury 1148
Lord Shuttleworth 1149

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Grey 1150

Page

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 19, to leave out Sub-section 3."—(*Earl Grey.*) ..

Earl Beauchamp 1150
The Marquess of Salisbury 1151
The Marquess of Bath 1151

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Lord Newton 1152

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out Sub-section 4."—(*Lord Newton.*)

Lord Farrer 1152
Earl Grey 1153
The Earl of Onslow 1154
The Earl of Crewe 1155
Earl Grey 1155
The Marquess of Salisbury 1155

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1156

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 38, after the words '874' to insert as a new sub-section the words: '(6.) On the confirmation of a new on-licence, the confirming authority may, with the consent of the justices of the licensing district, vary any conditions attached to the licence under the provisions of this section.' "—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

The Lord Bishop of Hereford 1157

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, after Clause 4, to insert the following clause: 'The licensing authorities before granting or renewing a licence may, at their discretion, require from the applicant for a licence an undertaking to the effect that he has not entered into, nor will, during the period for which the licence is valid, enter into, or become a party to, any agreement or contract whereby there is or may be granted or reserved to the owners or owner of the premises to which the licence attaches, or to any person or persons to be nominated by him or them, an exclusive right of supplying any or all of the alcoholic liquors to be sold by the applicant on the said premises; and any agreement or contract entered into by the applicant in contravention of such undertaking as aforesaid shall be null and void and shall entail the forfeiture of the licence.' "—(*The Lord Bishop of Hereford.*)

Lord Hylton 1163
The Earl of Onslow 1164

Aug. 5.] Page

On Question, "That the clause be added to the Bill," resolved in the negative.

Clause 5 :—

Lord Coleridge 1165

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 2, after the word 'committee' to insert the words 'consisting of members of the quarter sessions appointed by the quarter sessions and members of the county council appointed by the county council in equal numbers.'"—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

The Earl of Onslow 1166
Earl Spencer 1167
Lord Belper 1168
The Marquess of Ripon 1170
The Earl of Halsbury 1171
Lord Coleridge 1172

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 23 ; Not-Contents, 76.

Lord Davey 1173

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 5, after the word 'committees' to insert the words 'except as is hereinafter provided.'"—(*Lord Davey.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 1176
Lord Davey 1177

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Portsmouth 1177

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 18, after the word 'borough' to insert the words 'with a population of less than twenty-five thousand.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

Lord Belper 1180

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—

Lord Monkswell 1182

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 15, to leave out Sub-section (3)."—(*Lord Monkswell*).

The Marquess of Salisbury 1185
The Earl of Rosebery 1186

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," their Lordships divided :—Contents, 91 ; Not-contents, 32.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clause 8.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Lord Stanley of Alderley 1189

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 22, after the word 'refreshment,' to insert the words "at a reasonable price.'"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley*.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1189

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 24, after the first word 'to,' to insert the words 'give or,' and after the word 'undertaking' to insert the words 'required by or'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*.)

The Earl of Onslow 1190
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1191
Lord Farrer 1192
The Marquess of Salisbury 1192
Earl Spencer 1192
The Earl of Halsbury 1193
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1193

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Amendment moved—

"In page 26, line 25, to leave out the word 'previous.'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Aug. 5.] Page

Amendment moved—

"In page 26, line 27, after the words 'ill-conducted,' to insert the words 'provided that where the justices, on an application for the renewal of an existing on-licence, ask the licence-holder to give an undertaking as aforesaid, they shall adjourn the hearing of the application, and cause notice of the required undertaking to be served upon the registered owner of the premises, and give him an opportunity of being heard.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1195

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Carlisle 1195

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 30, to leave out from the word 'repealed' to the end of the sub-section."—(*The Earl of Carlisle.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1196
The Earl of Carlisle 1197
Earl Spencer 1197

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," their Lordships divided—Contents, 91; Not-contents. 27.

The Marquess of Bristol 1199

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 39, after the word 'sessions' to insert the words 'provided that the eastern and western divisions of Sussex and Suffolk Shall each be deemed a county for the purposes of this Act.'"—(*The Marquess of Bristol.*)

The Earl of Onslow 1200

On Question, Amendment negatived.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1201

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 21, after the word 'persons' to insert the words 'or may be transferred or removed to any other premises under Section 14 of the Alehouse Act, 1828, or Section 50 of the Licensing Act, 1872.'" —(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

The Earl of Crewe 1201
The Marquess of Salisbury 1202
Earl Grey 1203
Lord Davey 1203
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1205
Lord Burghclere 1206
The Marquess of Salisbury 1206

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In line 28, after the word 'licence' to insert as a new paragraph the words 'The expression 'transfer' means a transfer under Section four or fourteen of the Alehouse Act, 1828.' "—(*The Marquess of Salisbury*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9 :—

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 31, after the words ('1902') to insert the words '(3.) This Act shall come into operation on the first day of January one thousand nine hundred and five.' "—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, as amended.

The House then resumed.

Bill reported, with Amendments, to the House.

On Question, Standing Committee negatived.

The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 183.)

ARMY COUNCIL BILL [THIRD READING].—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

The Under-Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Donoughmore) .. 1208

On Question, "That the Bill be read a third time," resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read 3ª (according to order); an Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at half-past Eleven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. FRIDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

Mr. SPEAKER'S INDISPOSITION.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker owing to indisposition. Whereupon Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy-Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order 1209

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Bridlington Corporation Bill [LORDS]. (King's consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1209

Bristol Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1209

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [LORDS]. (King's consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1209

Trafford Park Bill [LORDS]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1209

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1209

Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; a Clause added; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 1210

PRIVATE BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 220 and 246, relating to Private Bills, be suspended for the remainder of the Session.

Ordered, That as regards Private Bills to be returned by the House of Lords with Amendments such Amendments (if unopposed) be considered forthwith.

Ordered, That as regards Private Bills returned, or to be returned, by the House of Lords with Amendments such Amendments (if opposed) shall be considered at such times as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine.

Ordered, That when it is intended to propose any Amendments thereto, a copy of such Amendments shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office, and notice given on the day on which the Bill shall have been returned from the Lords.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*) 1210

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1210

Aug. 5.] Page

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1210

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1210

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 1210

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1210

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Blyth, against; to lie upon the Table 1211

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Bolton, against; to lie upon the Table .. 1211

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Honiton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1211

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.—Petition from East Ham, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1211

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (EXPORTATION) (UNITED KINGDOM AND CONTINENTAL COUNTRIES).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th July; *Mr. Crombie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 313.] 1211

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings at the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under The Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, 16th June, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1211

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3246 and 3247 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1211

BRAZIL (No. 1, 1904).—Copy presented, of Award of His Majesty the King of Italy with regard to the Boundary between the Colony of British Guiana and the United States of Brazil [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1211

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

DISTURBANCES AT TEMPERANCE MEETINGS AT DUDLEY.—Question, Mr. Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas .. 1211

COMPENSATION TO SORTERS IN EAST CENTRAL SECTION OF GENERAL POST OFFICE FOR LOSS OF OVERCOATS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1212

Aug. 5.] *Page*

PAYMENT OF COTTAGERS FOR BOARDED OUT CHILDREN. — Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Walter Long .. 1212

CARE OF ORPHAN CHILDREN AND DESTITUTE POOR BY EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT. —Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Earl Percy 1213

PAROCHIAL MEDICAL OFFICERS (SCOTLAND) RETURN—ALLEGED INACCURACIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1213

FIRES CAUSED BY SPARKS FROM LOCOMOTIVES.—Question, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 1214

RULE OF THE ROAD AT SEA—SINGLE VESSELS AND SQUADRONS OF WARSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour .. 1215

SCOTCH EDUCATION—EQUIVALENT GRANT.—Question, Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1215

GOVERNMENT BORROWINGS—FALL IN CONSOLS.—Question, Mr. Bright (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1216

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—AGE LIMIT RETIREMENTS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1216

POLICE TESTIMONY AS TO CHARACTER OF PRISONERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1217

RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION OF POOR LAW OFFICERS IN ARMAGH.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell (Mayo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1217

FEMALE CATHOLIC TEACHER IN ARMAGH UNION.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1218

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.—Leave to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 314.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 314.]

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1.

Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 1220

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Sub-section (1)."—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'The Board of Education' stand part of the clause."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1224
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1224
Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 1225
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1225
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 1226
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1226
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 1227
Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 1227
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 1228
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1229
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 1229
Mr. Moss (Denbighshire, W.) 1230

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 146 ; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 311.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words 'Board of Education' stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 150 ; Noes, 68. (Division List No. 312.)

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1235

"In page 1, line 5, at beginning, to insert the words 'After holding a public inquiry at which all persons interested have been heard.'"—

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 1237
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1238
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1239
Mr. Gibson Bowles 1241
Mr. Emmott (Oldham) 1244
Mr. Lloyd-George 1245
Sir Robert Finlay 1247
Mr. Wm. Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) 1249
Mr. Wallace (Perth) 1250
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1252
Mr. Philips (Pembrokeshire) 1253

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 153 ; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 313.)

Question put accordingly, " That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 82 ; Noes, 166. (Division List No. 314.)

Whereupon Mr. A. J. Balfour claimed to move, " That the Question ' That the words of the clause to the word " make," inclusive, in line 10, stand part of the clause ' be now put."

Question, " That the Question ' That the words of the clause to the word " make," inclusive, in line 10, stand part of the clause ' be now put," put and agreed to.

Question, " That the words of the clause to the word ' make,' inclusive, in line 10, stand part of the clause," put, and agreed to.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment ; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Shop Hours Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 1269

A clause (Exemption of Shopkeeper.) — (*Sir Frederick Banbury.*) Brougt up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

Motion made,and Question proposed, " That the debate be now adjourned." (*Mr. Winston Churchill.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1270
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 1270
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 1270
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 1270
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1271
Mr. Chaplin (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 1271
Sir A. Acland Hood 1272
Mr. M'Kenna 1272
Mr. Gibson Bowles 1273
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) 1274

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed on Monday next.

Post Office Sites (Expenses).—Order for Committee thereupon read, and discharged.

Aug. 8.] *Page*

Post Office Sites Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 1274

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

The Postmaster-General (*Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton*) .. 1275

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1275
Mr. Runciman (*Dewsbury*) 1276

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill—[Second Reading].—Order for the Second Reading read.

Mr. M'Kenna 1272

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Mr. Trevelyan 1277
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 1277
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1277
Mr. H. J. Wilson (*Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth*) 1278
Mr. Wallace (*Perth*) 1278
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1278
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 1279
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1280

Question put, and agreed to.

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 8th AUGUST, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1281

Bridlington Corporation Bill [h.l.]; Bristol Corporation Bill [h.l.]; Buxton Urban District Council Bill [h.l.]; Trafford Park Bill [h.l.]; Stretford Urban District Council Bill [h.l.]; Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [h.l.];

Aug. 8.] *Page*

Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1281

De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1281

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill; Selby Urban District Council Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to.. 1281

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1281

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.. 1281

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1281

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to 1281

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. [H.L.].—Order of the Day for the consideration of the Commons Amendment, read, and discharged .. 1282

Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill.—The Acting Chairman of Committees (Lord Balfour of Burleigh) 1282

Moved, "That the promoters of the Bill have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon, in order to proceed with the Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than three o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

"That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than three o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit after the next meeting of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto, signed by the agent, stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

"That the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to every stage through which the same shall have passed in the present session, and that no new fees be charged in regard to such stages.

"That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Aug. 8.] Page

On Question, agreed to, and ordered accordingly. Ordered That a message be sent to the Commons to acquaint them with the said Resolution, and to desire their concurrence.

Bradford Corporation Act, 1903.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1284

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for Amendment of; of residents in Dudley; Rural Deanery of Wigton; North Cumberland Primrose League; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1284

LICENSING BILL.—Petition against; of Edward Owen; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1285

INTOXICATING LIQUORS.—Petition for restriction of sale of; of inhabitants of Carlisle; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1285

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (HEALTH).—Statistical Report of the Health of the Navy, for the year 1903 1285

SECONDARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Report, for the year 1904, by Sir Henry Craik, K.C.B. 1285

POST OFFICE.—Fiftieth Report of the Postmaster-General on the Post Office .. 1285

CUSTOMS.—Forty-eighth Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Custom, for the year ended 31st March, 1904 1285

INLAND REVENUE.—Forty-seventh Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Inland Revenue, for the year ended 31st March, 1904 1285

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Seventy-second Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, with appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1904 1285

INDIA (RAILWAYS).—Administration Report on the Railways in India, for the calendar year 1903 1285

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.—Annual Report of the President, for the year 1903–1904 1285

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.—Annual Report of the President, for the year 1903–1904 1285

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).—Fortieth Annual Report of the Registrar-General for the year 1903 1285

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3248. Italy (Province of Lecce).

No. 3249. Italy (South Italy).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table. 1286

Aug. 8.] Page

NAVAL SAVINGS BANK.—Acccount of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interest thereon, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the proceeds of any sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1902–1903 .. 1286

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.—Account showing the receipts and expenditure of Naval prize, bounty, salvage, and other moneys between 1st April, 1903, and 31st March, 1904 1286

COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1888.—Order of the Lord Chancellor, dated the 27th of July, 1904, under Section 45 of the Act, ordering that George Walton Walker, Registrar of the County Court of Staffordshire, held at West Bromwich, shall not practice as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of the said George Walton Walker 1286

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.—Return for the year ended 31st March, 1904, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Superannuation Act, 1887, to hold civil employment of profit under public Departments.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie upon the Table 1286

CHANTREY TRUST.—Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed; minutes of evidence, together with an appendix, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out. (No. 184.) 1286

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].—Minutes of evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out 1287

County of Suffolk Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 1287

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Moved, "That Standing Order XXI. be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting; and that the Order for receiving the Report of Amendments to the Licensing Bill have precedence of the other Notices and Orders of the day."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to 1287

Licensing Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order).

The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 1287

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 2, line 2, to leave out the words 'or refusal.'" —(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

Lord Stanley of Alderley 1287

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1288

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 2, line 3, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'including the justices of the licensing district.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

Lord Farrer 1288
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*The Earl of Onslow*) 1288
Earl Spencer 1289
Lord Belper 1289
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1290

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Camperdown 1290

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 6, to leave out the word 'a' and insert the words 'an existing on.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Grey 1291

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 10, after the word 'Act' to insert the words 'and in any case when the value of the licensed premises has been enhanced by a refusal to renew any other licence under this Act as if the value had not been so enhanced.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1294
The Earl of Crewe 1296
The Duke of Northumberland 1297
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1299
The Marquess of Huntly 1299
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 1299
The Marquess of Ripon 1301
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1301
Earl Spencer 1302
The Earl of Onslow 1302

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," their Lordships divided.—Contents, 21; Not-contents, 46.

The Earl of Onslow 1303

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, line 10, after the word 'Act' to insert 'and including in that value the amount of any depreciation of trade fixtures arising by reason of the refusal to renew the licence.'"—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

Lord Stanley of Alderley 1305
The Marquess of Salisbury 1305

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Huntly 1306

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 12, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'provided that when refusing the renewal of a licence in any parish, or the parish adjoining it, previous payments of compensation for licensed premises in those parishes be taken into account when determining the amount to be paid as compensation for the premises.'"—(*The Marquess of Huntly.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1306

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 28, to leave out the words 'for a year or.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 34, to insert as a new sub-section the words: '(4) Any costs incurred by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue on an appeal from their decision to the High Court under this section shall, unless the High Court order those costs to be paid by some party to the appeal other than the Commissioners, be paid out of the amount to be paid as compensation.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1307

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 29, after the word 'borrow' to insert the words 'for a period not exceeding seven years.'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

Lord Belper 1307
Earl Spencer 1308
Lord Zouche of Haryngworth 1308
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans 1309
The Marquess of Salisbury 1309
The Earl of Crewe 1310
The Marquess of Ripon 1310

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1310

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 32, to leave out Sub-section 6."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

Aug. 8]

Page

Earl Spencer .. 1311

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury .. 1311

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 3, line 39, to leave out the words 'of a licensing district.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Stanley of Alderley .. 1312

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 3, line 40, after the word 'licence' to insert the words 'or of an order sanctioning the transfer or removal of a licence under Section 50 of the Licensing Act, 1872.'"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) .. 1313
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury .. 1313
Earl Spencer .. 1313
The Marquess of Salisbury .. 1314
The Earl of Crewe .. 1315
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans .. 1315
The Lord Bishop of Londan .. 1316

On Question "That those words be there inserted," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 26; Not-Contents, 47.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury .. 1317

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 26, at end of line to insert the words 'and (*b*) any transfer of the licence shall, subject to any conditions attached thereto on the grant, have effect for the remainder of the term of the licence, and may be granted at a general annual licensing meeting as well as at special sessions, and any reference to special sessions in any enactment relating to transfers or protection orders shall include a reference to the general annual licensing meeting.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Grey .. 1317

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 28, to leave out from the word 'collected' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'and allocated to such purposes not properly chargeable to the rates as the confirming authority determine.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

Aug. 8 *Page*

The Marquess of Salisbury 1318
Earl Spencer 1318
The Lord Bishop of Chester 1319
The Earl of Crewe 1319

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Earl Grey 1320

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 28, to leave out from the word 'collected' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'allocated to such purposes of public benefit not chargeable to the rates as the confirming authority determine.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

Lord Stanley of Alderley 1320

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1320

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 41, and page 5, line 1, to leave out the words 'of the licensing district' and insert the words 'authorised to grant the licence.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1321

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 5, page 5, line 9, to leave out from the word 'them' to the second word 'and' in line 11, and insert the words 'under this section.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 5, page 5, line 16, at end of line to insert as a separate paragraph, the words 'Quarter sessions may make rules to be approved by a Secretary of State, for the mode of appointment of committees under this section, and for the number, the quorum, and (so far as procedure is not otherwise provided for) the procedure of those committees.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 21, to leave out the word 'but' and insert the word 'and.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Spencer 1321
Lord Belper 1322

Aug. 8.] Page

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, page 6, line 2, after the word 'time' to insert 'not exceeding fifteen years.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1323

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1323

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, page 6, line 5, after the word 'fund' to insert the words 'and of any sums paid in respect of new licences.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 6, after the word 'sessions' to insert the words 'and so far as respects sums paid for new licences, and the confirming authority.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1324

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, after Clause 6, to insert as a new clause the words 'Quarter sessions, with respect to their own action and that of the justices of licensing districts under this Act, and the confirming authority, with respect to new licences granted under this Act, shall in each year make such returns to the Secretary of State as the Secretary of State may require."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

The Earl of Camperdown 1324

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1325

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 32, after the word 'refreshment' to insert the words 'other than intoxicating liquor,' and after the word 'prices' to leave out the words 'other than intoxicating liquor.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow, and to be printed as amended. [No. 185.]

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

Lord Emly 1325
The Lord Chancellor of Ireland (*Lord Ashbourne*) 1326

Aug. 8.] Page

FEMALE INSPECTOR FOR IRISH WORKHOUSES.

Lord Emly 1327
Lord Ashbourne 1327

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1328

Electric Lighting (London) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1328

Post Office Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 1328

Leeds University Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed - .. 1328

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].—[THIRD READING].—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 3, line 36, after the word 'Board' to insert the words 'shall give every assistance in carrying out the provisions of this Act and, where necessary, shall employ their officers to facilitate its execution and.'"—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 7, page 4, line 36, after the word 'Acts' to insert the words 'every case under this Act may be prosecuted in any sheriff court which the Board may declare, by a notice under the hand of the Secretary to the Board to the procurator-fiscal of such sheriff court, to be the court nearest to the spot where the offence was committed, or otherwise the most convenient for the trial of the case.'"—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Moved, "That the Bill do now pass."—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Bill passed, and sent to the Commons. 1328

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—Rotherham Corporation Bill; Selby Urban District Council Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill. Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 1329

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords].—De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords]; Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1329

Belfast and North East Ireland Electricity and Power-Gas Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1329

Belfast Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and pased, with Amendments 1329

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered. An Amendment made. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1330

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1330

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill; Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill, without Amendment.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Loch Leven Water Power Bill; Leyton Urban District Council Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Amendments to—Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; King's College Hospital Bill [Lords]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; Manchester

Aug. 8.] *Page*

Ship Canal Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]; Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order, under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Ayr Corporation Tramways." [Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.] 1330

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th April; *Mr. John Edward Ellis*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 315.] 1331

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (BELFAST).—Copy presented, of Annual Report of the President for 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 1331

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of fortieth detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births, and Deaths in Ireland, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1331

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (GALWAY).—Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1331

SECONDARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—Copy presented, of Report for the year 1904 by Sir Henry Craik, K.C.B. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1331

MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH FOR COUNTIES.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th May; *Mr. Frederick Wilson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 316.] 1331

SANDGATE HOMES (PAUPER INMATES CHARGEABLE TO METROPOLITAN UNIONS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th June; *Sir Edward Sassoon*]; to lie upon the Table 1331

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS).—Copy presented, of Administration Report on the Railways in India for the year 1903, by C. W. Hodson, esquire, M. Inst. C.E., Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, Railways [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1331

POST OFFICE.—Copy presented, of Fiftieth Report of the Postmaster-General [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1332

CUSTOMS.—Copy presented, of Forty-eighth Report of the Commissioners of Customs for the year ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1332

INLAND REVENUE.—Copy presented, of Forty-seventh Report of the Commissioners, for the year ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1332

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Copy presented of Seventy-second Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, with Appendices, for the year ending 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1332

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd May; *Mr. Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 317.] 1332

Aug. 8.] *Page*

Government Departments (Contracts).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th July; *Sir Howard Vincent*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 318] 1332

Superannuation Act, 1887.—Copy presented, of Return for the year ended 31st March, 1904, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act, to hold Civil Employment of profit under Public Departments [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 319.] 1332

Trade Reports (Annual Series). Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3248 and 3249 [by Command]; to lie the Table upon 1332

Navy (Health).—Copy presented, of Statistical Report of the Health of the Navy for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 320.] ... .

Naval Prize Money.—Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage and other moneys between the 1st April, 1903, and 31st March, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 321.] .. ..

Naval Savings Banks.—Account presented, of deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof, and the interest thereon, etc., during the financial year 1902–3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 322.]

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—County Courts Act, 1888, and Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879. Copy of Order made by the Lord Chancellor, dated 27th July, 1904, directing that the Registrar of the County Court of Staffordshire, held at West Bromwich, shall not practise as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of Registrar of the said County Court [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; (Mayo, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1334

Foreign Seamen on British Ships—Numbers engaged at Shields, Cardiff, and Antwerp.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent; Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1334

Prices of and Duty on Wheat in United Kingdom, Germany, France and Italy.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1337

Electrical Lighting Provisional Orders granted to Local Authorities and others.—Question, Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1337

Yorkshire (West Riding) Education Committee—Deduction from Teacher's Salary for time spent in giving Denominational Instruction.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Sir William Anson 1338

Aug. 8.]

Page

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN NEW PROVIDED SCHOOLS—RIGHT OF PARENTS TO NOMINATE INSTRUCTOR.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Sir William Anson 1338

COMPENSATION FOR INJURY—CASE OF WILLIAM WELSFORD, SHIPWRIGHT, OF DEVONPORT DOCKYARD.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1339

KENT WATERWORKS PUMPING STATION AT DARENTH—INQUIRY INTO PURITY OF WATER.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1339

TELEPHONE TRUNK CALLS BETWEEN 8 P.M. SATURDAY AND 8 A.M. ON MONDAY.—Question, Mr. Brotherton (Wakefield); Answer, Lord Stanley 1340

PROTECTION OF SALMON AND SEA TROUT—ACTION OF THE FISHMONGERS' COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1340

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (MONEY) BILL.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1342

PUBLICATION OF DEPARTMENTAL HISTORY OF LORD CURZON'S ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1342

CUTTING OF TURF BY TENANTS FROM BOG AT CARNAGH, PARISH OF ST. JOHN'S, ATHLONE.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1342

LONDONDERRY PRISON OFFICIALS.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1343

PROMOTION OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1344

COST PER HEAD OF VOLUNTEER FORCE—ITEMS ON WHICH REDUCTION IS TO BE EFFECTED.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1345

ALLOTMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN WAR TROPHIES.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1345

COST PER HEAD OF BRITISH SOLDIERS ABROAD.—Question, Mr. H. J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1346

PRESERVATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS IN LAGOS.—Question, Sir Henry Seton-Karr (St. Helen's); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1347

PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Question, General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1348

PROTECTION OF TRADE UNION FUNDS—SUGGESTED LEGISLATION.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1348

ROYAL COMMISSION ON TRADE DISPUTES.—Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1348

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Rearmament of the Artillery.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford 1348

Porthcawl Rifle Range.—Question, Mr. Fuller (Wiltshire, Westbury); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1349

Summer Headgear for Soldiers.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1349

South African Campaign—Honorary Army Rank for Officers of the Auxiliary Forces.—Question, Sir Lees Knowles (Salford, W.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1350

South African Shipping Freights Conference.—Question, Sir Lees Knowles; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1350

Indian Government Departments—Distribution of Work and Salaries.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1351

Anglo-French Convention—Germany and Egyptian Clauses.—Questions, Mr. Weir and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1351

Crime in Egypt.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Earl Percy 1352

Egypt and the Anglo-French Agreement.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Earl Percy 1352

American Tariff on Pickled Fish.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Earl Percy 1353

The Post Office and the National Telephone Company.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1354

Illegible Postmarks.—Question, Mr. Skewes Cox (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Lord Stanley 1354

Vaccination Exemption Certificates.—Questions, Mr. Weir and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. AkersDouglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1354

Metropolitan Hackney Carriages—Police Examination.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1355

Life Saving Gear on Passenger Ships to and from the Continent.—Question Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1355

Caledonian and North British Railway—Workmen's Trains.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1356

Aug. 8.] Page

Fenit Harbour Board.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.), and Mr. Flynn (Cork County N.); Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1356

Exports of Smokeless Steam Coal to Russia and Japan —Question, Sir Lees Knowles; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1357

Treatment of London Pauper Consumptives.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1357

Cooseroum Boat Slip.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1358

Marlborough Street Training College, Dublin.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1359

Police Constable Robinson of Letterfract.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1359

St. Lukes National School, Cork—Examination in Irish.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1360

Marshall Estate, Kerry.—Questions, Thomas O'Donnell and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1360

Irish National Foresters Demonstration at Cookstown.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1360

Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction—Literature for Village Libraries.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1361

Rowe Estate, County Wexford. — Question, Mr. Ffrench; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1362

Roscommon and Leitrim County Court Judgeship.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1362

Dillon Estate, Ballaghaderreen.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1363

Irish Local Government Board Surcharges. — Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1363

Cookstown Disturbances—Father M'Brien's Complaint.—Question, Mr. Doogan (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1364

Rents in County Down.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1364

The Earl of Shaftesbury's Antrim Tenants.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1365

Limerick and Extra Police Charges.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.) and Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1365

Aug. 8.] Page

EXTRA POLICE CHARGES IN IRELAND—EXCHEQUER LOSS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1366

VETERINARY BRANCH OF IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—PROMOTION GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1366

VETERINARY DEPARTMENT STAFF SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1367

RECRUITING IN IRELAND—DISLOYAL NOTICES AT MAGHERA.—Questions, Mr. Gordon (Londonderry, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1367

IRISH LACE FRAUDS AT NICE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1368

CURRAGH CAMP BUILDING CONTRACTS.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1368

PURCHASES OF ARMY REMOUNTS IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Ffrench and Mr. Delany; Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1369

IRISH LOCAL LOAN FUNDS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) .. 1369

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS IN COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1370

IRISH TOWN SUB-POSTMASTERS' GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Lord Stanley 1370

RUSSIAN SEIZURES OF BRITISH SHIPS—THE CASE OF THE "MALACCA".—Questions. Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1371

THE SINKING OF THE "KNIGHT COMMANDER".—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1373

PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1374

THE COLONIES AND THE FISCAL QUESTION.—Questions, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) and Sir Howard Vincent; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1375

TELEGRAPH VOTE—BRADFORD COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor and Mr. Nannetti; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1375

SPECIE COMMANDEERED BY THE BOERS DURING THE WAR.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1375

NAVAL WORKS EXPENDITURE.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1376

EXPORTS OF SMOKELESS STEAM COAL.—Question, Sir Lees Knowles; Answer, Mr A. J. Balfour 1376

Aug. 8.] *Page*

Business of the House.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Blake (Longford, S.); Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); and Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1377

Supply of Electricity Bill.—Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Supply of Electricity Bill, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 1378

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill.—Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 1378

Sea Fisheries Bill.—Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Sea Fisheries Bill, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 1378

Chantrey Trust.—Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Chantrey Trust, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 1379

Message from the Lords.

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill. That they request that this House will be pleased to communicate to their Lordships a Copy of the Reports, etc., of the Select Committee appointed by this House in the present session on Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.

Printed Copy to be communicated.

That they have agreed to—Wild Birds Protection Acts Amendment (St. Kilda) Bill; University of Liverpool Bill.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to provide for the Re-vaccination of children after the age of twelve." [Re-vaccination Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill intituled, " An Act to transfer to the Army Council certain statutory powers and duties of the Secretary of State and other officers; and and for other purposes connected therewith." [Army Council Bill [Lords.] 1379

Army Council Bill [Lords]. — Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 296.] 1379

Aug. 8.] *Page*

NEW BILL.

Criminal New Trials Bill.—" To make provision for a New Trial in certain Criminal cases," presented by Mr. Bousfield ; supported by Mr. Lawson Walton ; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 297.] 1379

SUPPLY [21ST ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £331,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges of the War Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) .. 1380
Lord George Hamilton (Middlesex, Ealing) 1396
Sir A. Hayter (Walsall) 1402
Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 1407
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 1408
Mr. Llewellyn (Somersetshire, N.) 1419
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1426
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1432
Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 1433
Mr. C. R. Spencer (Northamptonshire, Mid.) 1435
Sir Lees Knowles (Salford, W.) 1436

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [21ST ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—£331,000, War Office, Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges.

Sir Lees Knowles 1438
Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 1441
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (Kent, Tunbridge) 1446

Aug 8.] *Page*

Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 1450
Colonel Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle) 1455
Mr. Guest (Plymouth) 1458
Mr. Arnold-Forster 1461
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 1469

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Wednesday; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

Cunard Agreement (Money) Bill [Second Reading.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1471

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) .. 1474
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) 1474
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 1475

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 34. (Division List No. 315.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill. [Second Reading.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time"

Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 1480
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1481

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

Question, proposed "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) 1481
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1482
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1482
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 1484

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 129 ; Noes, 32. (Division List, No. 316.)

Bill read a second time, and committed for this day.

Dogs Bill.—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [23rd March], " That the Bill be now read a second time," read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1485

Marine Insurance Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1485

Port of London Bill.—Order for Committee read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1486

Bishopric of Bristol Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1486

Provisional Order (Marriages) Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd May], " That the Bill be now read a second time," read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1486

Land Tax Commissioners Names Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1487

Site for Duke of York's School Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1487

Constabulary (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn. 1487

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Committee read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1487

Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1487

Post Office Sites Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 to 5 agreed to.

Clause 6.

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1487

Clause 6 agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment, read the third time, and passed.

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed for this day 1487

Government h ips Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1488

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the Whole House.—(*Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*)

Resolved, That this House will, upon Friday, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) 1488

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS (REMISSION).—Committee to consider of authorising the Remission of a Debt due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland in pursuance of any Act of the present session relating to Local Loans (King's Recommendation signified), this day.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) .. 1488

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1902–3.—Committee to consider the savings and Deficiencies upon Navy and Army Grants for 1902-3, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to the Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, this day.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish*)

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented on the 15th day of February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) 1488

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS FOUNDATION.—Resolved, That the statement of the estimated Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers Foundation for the year 1904–5 be approved.—(*Mr. Arthur Lee.*) 1488

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. Deputy-Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at eighteen minutes before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Carlisle Corporation Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1489

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]; De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 1489

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill.—[H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1489

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1489

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; Leyton Urban District Council Bill; Loch Leven Water Power Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1489

Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 1489

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmaton Bill; Glasgow and South-Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill; Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1489

STANDING ORDERS.

The Acting Chairman of Committees (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) .. 1489

Moved, that the Standing Orders be amended as follows—

26. In cases where tidal lands within the ordinary spring tides are to be acquired or in any way affected a copy of the plans and sections shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November immediately preceding the application for the Bill, be deposited at the Office of the Harbour Department, Board of Trade, marked "Tidal Waters," and on such copy all tidal waters shall be coloured blue and, if the plan include any bridge across tidal waters, the dimensions as regards span and headway of the nearest bridges, if any, across the same tidal waters, above and below the proposed new bridge, shall be marked thereon; and in all such cases, such plans and sections shall be accompanied by an Ordnance map of the country over which the works are proposed to extend, or are to be carried, with their position and extent, or route accurately laid down thereon.

And in cases where the work is to be situate on the banks, foreshore, or bed of any river, a copy of the plans and sections shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November immediately preceding the application for the Bill, be deposited—

(1) If the river is in England or Wales, at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries; or

(2) if the river is in Scotland, at the office of the Secretary for Scotland; or

(3) if the river is in Ireland, at the Irish Office, Westminster, and at the Office of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, Dublin; and

(4) if the river is subject to a Board of Conservators, at the Office also of such Board.

30. Where by any Bill power is sought to take any churchyard, burial ground, or cemetery, or any part thereof, or to disturb the bodies interred therein, or where power is sought to take any common or commonable land, as

Aug. 9.]

the case may be, a copy of so much of the plans, sections, and books of reference required by these Orders to be deposited in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments in respect of such Bill as relates to such churchyard, burial ground or cemetery, common or commonable land, shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November, be deposited at the Office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and a copy of so much of the said plans, sections, and books of reference as relates to such common or commonable lands shall, on or before the said day, be deposited at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

33. On or before the twenty-first day of December a printed copy shall be deposited—

(1.) Of every Local Bill at the Office of His Majesty's Treasury, at the Local Government Board, and at the General Post Office;

(4.) Of every local Bill relating to any dock, harbour, navigation, pier, port, or tidal waters, at the Office of the Harbour Department of the Board of Trade, marked "Tidal Waters."

(5.) Of every Bill of the Second Class whereby it is intended to authorise the construction of any work on the banks, foreshore, or bed of any river, at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and at the Office of the Conservators of the River (if any);

(7.) Of every Local Bill—

(*a*) relating to a local court or stipendiary magistrate;

(*b*) whereby power is sought to take any churchyard, burial ground, cemetery, or any part thereof, or to disturb the bodies interred therein, or to take any common or commonable land;

(*c*) in which provisions are contained relating to houses inhabited by the working class in London;

(*d*) Promoted by any Municipal or other Local Authority, by which it is proposed to create powers relating to police or sanitary regulations which deviate from, or are in extension of, or repugnant to the general law;

at the Office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department;

(12) Of every local Bill which relates to the drainage of land in England or Wales, or which relates to the improvement of land in England, Wales, or Scotland, or to the erection, improvement, repair, maintenance or regulation of any market or market place at which cattle are exposed for sale, or to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries or which proposes to alter the boundary of any county, urban or rural district, parish, or any other administrative area in the United Kingdom, or whereby power is sought to take any common or commonable land, at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Leave out Standing Order 38 and insert as a new Standing Order—

38. Where any Bill contains or revives or extends power to take compulsorily or by agreement any land in any local area as defined for the purposes of this Order, and such taking involves, or may involve, the taking in of that area of any house or houses occupied either wholly or partially by thirty or more persons of the working class, whether as tenants or lodgers, the promoters shall deposit in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, and at the office of the central authority, on or before the 21st day of December, a statement giving the description and postal address of each of such houses, its

number on the deposited plans, the parish in which it is situate, and the number (so far as can be ascertained) of persons of the working class residing in it, and also a copy of so much of the deposited plans (if any) as relates thereto.

This Order shall not apply where a statement in pursuance of this Order was deposited in respect of the Act, the powers of which are proposed to be revived or extended.

For the purposes of this Order the expression " local area " means—

(1) As respects London, the Administrative County of London;

(2) As respects England and Wales (outside London), any borough, or other urban district, and elsewhere than in a borough or other urban district, any parish;

(3) As respects Scotland, any district within the meaning of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; and

(4) As respects Ireland, any urban district;

The expression " house " means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling.

The expression " working class " means mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons, other than domestic servants, whose income in any case does not exceed an average of thirty shillings a week and the families of any of such persons who may be residing with them.

The expression " central authority " means, as regards London, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and, as regards England and Wales (outside London), the Local Government Board, as regards Scotland, the Secretary for Scotland, and as regards Ireland, the Local Government Board for Ireland.

The expression " Bill " includes a Bill confirming a Provisional Order.

77. The Examiner may admit affidavits in proof of the compliance with the Standing Orders, or may require further evidence; and such affidavits shall be sworn, if in England or in Ireland, before a justice of the peace or commissioner for oaths, and if in Scotland, before any sheriff depute or his substitute, or a justice of the peace.

104*a*. The Committee on any Local Bill may, if they think fit, admit affidavits in proof of any allegation, deed, or document mentioned or set forth in the Bill or in any schedule thereto, or may require further evidence. Such affidavits shall be entitled " In the matter of a Bill now pending in the House of Lords, of which the short title is [insert the short title]," and shall be sworn if in England or in Ireland, before a justice of the peace or a commissioner for oaths, and if in Scotland, before any sheriff depute or his substitute, or a justice of the peace. Such affidavits shall be filed in the office of the Clerk of the Parliaments.

111. In the case of every Bill which gives, revives, or extends power to take land in Scotland or in Ireland, compulsorily or by agreement, clauses shall be inserted—

(1) Providing that the promoters shall not in the exercise of such power purchase or require in any local area any house or houses, occupied either wholly or partially by thirty or more persons belonging to the working class, as tenants or lodgers unless and until

(*a*) They shall have obtained the approval of the Central Authority to a scheme for providing new dwellings for the persons residing in such houses, or for such number or proportion of such persons as the Central Authority shall, after inquiry, deem necessary, having regard to the number of persons residing in the houses liable to be taken and working within one mile therefrom, and to the amount of vacant suitable accommodation in the immediate neighbourhood of the houses liable to be taken, or to the place of employment of such persons, and all the other circumstances of the case; and

(*b*) They shall have given security to the satisfaction of the Central Authority for the carrying out of the scheme.

(2) Imposing adequate penalties on the promoters in the event of houses being acquired or appropriated for the purposes of the Bill in contravention of the foregoing provisions.

(3) Providing that the expenses or any part of the expenses incurred by the Central Authority under this Order shall be defrayed by the Promoters of the Bill, or out of moneys to be raised under the Bill; and

(4) Conferring on the promoters and on the Central Authority respectively any powers that may be necessary to enable full effect to be given to the said scheme.

Expressions defined in Order 38 have the same meanings in this Order.

NEW STANDING ORDER.—186A. Where under the provisions of Section 9 of the Procedure Act, a Confirmation Bill has been referred to a Joint Committee, the Committee of this House shall consist of three members.—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Agreed to.

Standing Orders amended accordingly, and to be printed as amended. [No. 187.] 1495

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, " That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Earl of Denbigh.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1495

On Question, Motion agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

STATISTICS.

1. Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates in each year from 1889 to 1903. Forty-first Number.

2. Statistical Tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates. Part XXVII. 1902 1495

BRITISH COLONIES (DUTIES ON IMPORTS).—Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the the British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates. 1904 .. 1496

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.—Appendix to the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. Vol. III. Appendix and General Index 1496

TREATY SERIES, No. 5 (1904).—Accession of China to the Convention, signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded armies in the field 1496

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3250. Turkey (Salonica).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1496

CLERGY (WEST INDIES).—Return of the amount payable on 5th January, 1904, out of the Consolidated Fund for ecclesiastical purposes in the West Indies. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1496

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.].—Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [H.L.]; Sea Fisheries Bill [H.L.]; Chantrey Trust. Message from the Commons for copies of the Reports, etc., from the Select Committees. Ordered to be communicated accordingly 1496

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.—Report, etc., of the Select Committee of the House of Commons communicated, pursuant to Message of Thursday last, and to be printed. (No. 186.) 1496

County of Suffolk Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1496

Licensing Bill.—[THIRD READING.]—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Belper.*)

Earl Spencer 1497
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 1502
Lord Belper 1504
The Acting Chairman of Committees (Lord Balfour of Burleigh) 1507
The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Salisbury) 1514
The Lord Bishop of London 1519

On Question, Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Aug. 9.] *Page*

NAVAL ADMINISTRATION.

Lord Brassey 1521
Lord Ellenborough 1525
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*The Earl of Selborne*) 1526
Earl Spencer 1537

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.].—Third Reading (which stands appointed for this day) put off to Thursday next 1538

Post Office Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order) and passed 1539

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES.—First Report of the Select Committee. Considered (according to order), and agreed to 1539

Post Office Sites Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 188.) 1539

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; Leyton Urban District Council Bill; Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1539

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [LORDS]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1539

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered upon Thursday (Evening Sitting). 1539

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow 1539

Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—To be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 300.] 1539

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—To be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301.] 1539

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Leeds University Bill; Electric Lighting (London) Bill, without Amendment.

Licensing Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill; Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill, with Amendments.

Aug. 9.] Page

Amendments to—Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Trafford Park Bill [Lords]; Stretford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power-Gas Bill [Lords]; Belfast Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to Regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland." [Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled. "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to lating to Glasgow Corporation (Sewage)." [Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill.—That they have come to the following Resolution, viz.:—

That the Promoters of the Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon in order to proceed with the Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next Session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit after the next meeting of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto, signed by the Agent, stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present Session.

That the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to every stage through which the same shall have passed in the present session, and that no new fees be charged in regard to such stages.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session; and desire the concurrence of this House in such Resolution 1540

STANDING ORDERS.

Moved, that the Standing Orders relating to Private Business be amended as follows:—

In page 57, Standing Order 9, paragraph (2), line 2, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (2), line 3, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 2, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 3, after the word " taking," to insert the words " or compulsory user."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 13, after the word, " taken," to insert the words " or compulsorily used."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 15, after the word " taking " to insert the words " or compulsory user."

In page 60, Standing Order 24, at end, after the word " Agriculture," to add the words " and Fisheries."

In page 61, Standing Order 26, line 4, to leave out the words " Fisheries and."

In page 61, Standing Order 26a, line 5, after the words " of the," to insert the words " Board of Agriculture and."

In page 61, Standing Order 26a, line 6, to leave out the words, " and Harbour Department of the Board of Trade."

In page 62, Standing Order 30, at end, after the word " Agriculture," to add the words " and Fisheries."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, paragraph (4), line 2, to leave out the words " Fisheries and."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, paragraph (5), line 3, after the words " of the," to insert the words " Board of Agriculture and."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, paragraph (5), lines 3 and 4, to leave out the words " and Harbour Departments of the Board of Trade ."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, pargraph (7), line 7, to leave out the word " labouring," and to insert the word " working."

In page 64, Standing Order 33, paragraph (14), line 6, after the word " Agriculture," to insert the words " and Fisheries."

In page 64, Standing Order 33, paragraph (14), at end, after the word " Agriculture," to add the words " and Fisheries."

In page 65, to leave out Standing Order 38, and to insert new Standing Order 38—

> 38. Where any Bill contains or revives or extends power to take compulsorily or by agreement any land in any local area as defined for the purposes of this Order, and such taking involves, or may involve, the taking in that area of any house or houses occupied either wholly or partially by thirty or more persons of the working class, whether as tenants or lodgers, the promoters shall deposit in the Private Bill Office, and at the office of the central authority, on or before the 21st day of December, a statement giving the description and postal address of each of such houses, its number on the deposited plans, the parish in which it is situate, and the number (so far as can be ascertained) of persons of the working class residing in it, and also a copy of so much of the deposited plans (if any) as relates thereto.
>
> This Order shall not apply where a statement in pursuance of this Order was deposited in respect of the Act, the powers of which are proposed to be revived or extended.

For the purposes of this Order the expression "local area" means—

(1) As respects London the Administrative County of London.

(2) As respects England and Wales (outside London) any borough, or other urban district, and elsewhere than in a borough or other urban district, any parish.

(3) As respects Scotland, any district within the meaning of The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; and

(4) As respects Ireland, any urban district.

The expression "house" means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling.

The expression "working class" means mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons, other than domestic servants, whose income in any case does not exceed an average of thirty shillings a week and the families of any of such persons who may be residing with them.

The expression "central authority" means, as regards London, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and, as regards England and Wales, outside London, the Local Government Board, as regards Scotland, the Secretary for Scotland, and, as regards Ireland, the Local Government Board for Ireland.

The expression "Bill" includes a Bill confirming a Provisional Order.

In page 80, Standing Order 76, line 3, after the word "England," to insert the words "or in Ireland."

In Standing Order 76, line 4, after the word 'oaths," to insert the word "and."

In Standing Order 76, to leave out from the word "and," in line 5, to end of Order.

In page 81, Standing Order 84, line 11, after the words "Agriculture," to insert the words "and Fisheries."

In page 86, Standing Order 128, line 7, after the word "Bills," to insert the words "originating in this House."

In page 87, to leave out Standing Order 133a, and insert new Standing Order 133a—

133a. Where any society or association sufficiently representing a trade, business, or interest in any district to which any Bill relates, petition against the Bill alleging that such trade, business, or interest will be injuriously affected by the provisions contained therein, it shall be competent to the Referees on Private Bills, if they think fit, to admit the petitioners to be heard on such allegations against the Bill or any part thereof.

Aug. 9.] Page

In page 88, Standing Order 141, line 4, after the word "England," to insert the words "or in Ireland."

In Standing Order 141, line 5, after the word "Oaths," to insert the word "and."

In Standing Order 141, to leave out from the word "and," in line 6, to the the end of the Order.

In page 99, Standing Order 184, line 2, after the word "land," to insert the words "in Scotland or Ireland."

In Standing Order 184, paragraph (1), to leave out from the second word "in," in line 2, to the second word "more," in line 3, and to insert the words "any house or."

In Standing Order 184, paragraph (1), line 4, after the word "by," to insert the words "thirty or more."

In Standing Order 184, paragraph (1), line 4, to leave out the word "labouring," and insert the word "working."

In page 100, Standing Order 184, to leave out from the words "the Committee," in line 15 of the page, to the word "Bill," in line 20.

In page 108, Standing Order 207, at end, add—

Provided that where any such Opposed Private Business is set down to be taken at the beginning of an Evening Sitting and is disposed of, any Motion contingent directly or otherwise thereon may with the assent of the Chair be considered and disposed of at the same sitting.

In page 119, insert new Standing Order 254a—

254a. Where, under the provisions of Section 9 of the Procedure Act, a Confirmation Bill has been referred to a Joint Committee, the Committee of this House shall consist of three members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

Mr. J. W. Lowther 1545

Objection being taken by Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) to an Amendment to Standing Order 33, consideration of the Motion was postponed till Thursday at the Evening Sitting.

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petition from Bethnal Green, against; to lie upon the Table 1546

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Sandgate Homes (Pauper Inmates Chargeable to Metropolitan Unions.—Return [presented 8th August] to be printed. [No. 323.] 1546

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899.—Return presented relative thereto [ordered 3rd August; *The Lord Advocate*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 324.] 1546

Aug. 9.] *Page*

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894 (ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd August; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 325.] .. 1546

INSPECTION OF MEAT.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th July; *Mr. Field*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 326.] 1546

CLERGY (WEST INDIES).—Copy presented, of Return of the Amount payable on 5th January, 1904, out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical purposes in the West Indies [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1546

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.—Copy presented of Appendix to the Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1547

TREATY SERIES (No. 5, 1904).—Copy presented, of Accession of China to the Convention signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, dated 29th June, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1547

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3250 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1547

COLONIAL STATISTICS.—Copy presented, of Statistical Tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates Part. XXVII. for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1547

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (COLONIES).—Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates in each year from 1889 to 1903, Forty-first Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1547

COLONIAL IMPORT DUTIES, 1904.—Copy presented, of Return relating to the Rates of Import Duties levied upon the principal and other Articles imported into the British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1547

TRAINING COLLEGES (IRELAND).—Return ordered, "for the years 1902–3 and 1903–4, respectively, giving (1) the names of the Training Colleges in Ireland, whether under the management of the National Board or under local management, on behalf of which application was made to the Commissioners of National Education within the last three years to sanction an increase in the number of King's Scholars which each such College was authorised to admit to training; (2) the number of King's Scholars in each such case which each such College was authorised to admit at the time of the above application; (3) the increased number of King's Scholars asked to be authorised for admission in each case; (4) the decisions of the Commissioners of National Education in each case, giving, if the decision was favourable, the increase authorised in each case (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 288, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Boland.*) 1547

CASUALTIES TO SHIPS.—Return ordered, "of Casualties to Ships, showing the date, the name and class of the Ship damaged, the nature of the accident, the number of persons injured, the number of deaths (if any), the result of any inquiry that may have been held into the circumstances, and time in dockyard for repairs, during the year ending the 31st day of December, 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 317, of Session 1903."—(*Mr. Lough.*) 1548

Aug. 9.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

MANAGEMENT OF CELLS AT POLICE STATIONS—SUGGESTED INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas .. 1548

DENBIGHSHIRE BURIAL DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1549

AUDIT OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES' ACCOUNTS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1549

RAILS AND ENGINEERING PLANT ORDERED BY LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL FROM BRITISH AND FOREIGN FIRMS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1550

HOUSING ACTS—CONCENTRATION OF ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1550

EXPLOSION CAUSED BY LEAKAGE OF ELECTRIC CURRENT AND ESCAPED GAS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar; Answer, Lord Stanley 1551

PROMOTION OF GLASGOW ASSISTANT POSTMEN.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1551

SEVENTH HOUR DAILY ATTENDANCE—EXTENSION OF LEAVE OF POSTAL OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1552

VENTILATION AND CLEANING OF BELFAST SORTING OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1552

SUPERANNUATION OF MR. MURRAY, OF POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, Lord Stanley 1552

FOUNDATION MANAGERS OF CARNARVONSHIRE NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. George Kenyon (Denbigh Boroughs); Answer, Sir William Anson ..1553

VALUE OF IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURED AND PARTLY MANUFACTURED ARTICLES.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1554

PRISON OFFICIALS' QUARTERS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1555

ALLEGED EXCESSIVE SENTENCE ON NATIVE AT DIBRUGARH, ASSAM.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1556

COMPLAINTS AGAINST ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1556

MILITARY FINANCE—RECOMMENDATIONS OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE AND WAR OFFICE RECONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.—Question, Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1556

NIGER AND LAKE CHAD BOUNDARY COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, Earl Percy 1557

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

CONVEYANCE OF EXPLOSIVES ON PASSENGER STEAMERS.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1557

NIGER AND LAKE CHAD BOUNDARY COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Norman; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1558

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1559

INDIAN FINANCE—INDIAN TROOPS LENT FOR IMPERIAL PURPOSES.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1559

INDIANS IN JAPAN.—Question, Mr. Norman; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1559

INDIAN ARISTOCRACY AND THE IMPERIAL CADET CORPS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1560

EGYPTIAN FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1560

TUNG-TING LAKE.—Question, Mr. Norman; Answer, Earl Percy 1560

WEI-HAI-WEI.—Question, Mr. Norman; Answer, Earl Percy 1561

DUTCH COLONIAL AUTHORITIES AND MR. JOHN GODDEN.—Questions, Sir Ernest Flower (Bradford, W.); Answers, Earl Percy 1561

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REPORT.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1561

EXAMINATION OF STOCK OF STAMPS, ETC., OF POST OFFICE COUNTER CLERKS IN LONDON.—Question, Mr. David Morgan (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, Lord Stanley 1562

DUTIES ON PUBLICANS' LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1563

AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION.—Question, Mr. Fuller (Wiltshire, Westbury); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 1563

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT—MEMBERS' POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) .. 1564

KINGSTON ESTATE—EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork Co., N.E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1564

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1565

MITCHELSTOWN RENT APPEALS.—Question, Mr. William Abraham; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1565

Aug. 9.] Page

BELFAST SORTERS' WAGE GRIEVANCE.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1566

BELFAST POST OFFICE—CLOAK ROOM ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Lord Stanley 1566

BELFAST BOY SORTER'S ILLNESS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Lord Stanley 1566

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.), Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) and Mr. Blake (Longford, S.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1567

LICENSING BILL.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 298.] 1567

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 299.] 1567

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).—Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 327.] 1567

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Rufus Daniel Isaacs, esquire, K.C., for the Borough of Reading 1567

SUPPLY [22ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith,) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS IV.

I. £1,550, to complete the sum for National Gallery, etc., Scotland.

Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow, College) 1568
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1570
Mr. Ure (Linlithgowshire) 1577
Mr. Wylie (Dumbartonshire) 1581
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1582
Mr. Wallace (Perth) 1585
Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) 1587
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) 1588
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 1589
Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell 1589
Mr. A. Graham Murray 1590

Vote agreed to.

CLASS II.

£9,598 to complete the sum for the Local Government Board for Scotland.

Mr. Weir 1591
The Lord Advocate (*Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton*) 1594
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 1597

Vote agreed to.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made,and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,615,509, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Working Expenses of the Post Office Telegraph Service."

Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 1600
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 1605
Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 1610
Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) 1613
Mr. Rutherford (*Lancashire, Darwen*) 1615
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 1617
Mr. Henniker Heaton (*Canterbury*) 1619
Mr. Nannetti (*Dublin, College Green*) 1621

And it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee also report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [22ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.] .. ..

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,615,509, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Working Expenses of the Post Office Telegraph Service."

Mr. Nannetti 1622
Sir James Haslett (*Belfast, N.*) 1624
Mr. Norman (*Wolverhampton, S.*) 1628
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 1628
The Postmaster-General (*Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton*) .. 1630

ug. 9.]

And, it being Ten of the Clock, the Chairman proceded to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote under consideration.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 172 ; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 317.)

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order 15, to put severally the Questions, That the total amounts of the Votes outstanding in each Class of the Civil Service Estimates, including Supplementary Estimates, and the total amount of the Votes outstanding in the Estimates for the Navy, Army, and Revenue Departments, be granted for the Services defined in those Classes and Estimates.

CLASS I.

2. Question put, " That a sum, not exceeding £1,088,788, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Services, included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
2. Osborne (including a Supplementary sum of £5,450)	10,550
3. Royal Parks and Pleasure Grounds	69,100
5. Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain	40,700
6. Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain	26,300
7. Diplomatic and Consular Buildings	38,000
9. Public Buildings, Great Britain	90,900
10. Surveys of the United Kingdom	220,409
1. Peterhead Harbour	122,000
13. Rates on Government Property	332,277
14. Public Works and Buildings, Ireland	110,737
15. Railways, Ireland	27,815
	£1,088,788"

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 181 ; Noes 85. (Division List No. 318.)

CLASS II.

3. Question put, " That a sum, not exceeding £1,263,014, be granted to his Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. House of Lords Offices	9,868
2. House of Commons Offices	21,060
3. Treasury and Subordinate Offices	54,639
4. Home Office	104,094
5. Foreign Office	35,771
6 Colonial Office	27,750
7. Privy Council Office	5,680
9. Mercantile Marine Services	69,251
10. Bankruptcy Department of Board of Trade	9
11. Board of Agriculture and Fisheries	54,337

	£
12. Charity Commission	14,633
13. Civil Service Commission	25,110
14. Exchequer and Audit Department	39,054
15. Friendly Societies Registry	4,881
16. Local Government Board	142,089
18. Mint, including Coinage	63
19. National Debt Office	7,439
20. Public Record Office	14,965
21. Public Works Loan Commission	7
22. Registrar General's Office	22,146
23. Stationery and Printing	404,362
24. Woods, Forests, etc., Office of	13,171
25. Works and Public Buildings Office	39,649
26. Secret Service	25,000

Scotland.

27. Secretary for Scotland's Office	10,495
28. Fishery Board	10,155
29. Lunacy Commission	3,423
30. Registrar General's Office	2,732

Ireland.

32. Lord Lieutenant's Household	2,826
33. Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices	14,371
35. Charitable Donations and Bequests Office (including a Supplementary sum of £130)	1,148
36. Local Government Board	37,886
37. Public Record Office, Ireland	3,254
38. Public Works Office	21,773
39. Registrar General's Office	6,716
40. Valuation and Boundary Survey	13,207
	£1,263,014 "

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 183 ; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 319.)

CLASS III.

4. Question put, " That a sum, not exceeding £2,016,511, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Law Charges	35,232
2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	22,199
3. Supreme Court of Judicature	177,515
4. Land Registry	28,827
5. County Courts	23,000
6. Police, England and Wales	25,854
7. Prisons, England and the Colonies	375,762
8. Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	113,957
9. Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	21,701

Aug. 9.]

(Scotland.)

	£
10. Law Charges and Courts of Law	54,148
11. Register House, Edinburgh	27,678
12. Crofters' Commission	2,590
13. Prisons	50,570

(Ireland.)

14. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	33,416
15. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments	57,718
17. County Court Officers, etc.	66,584
18. Dublin Metropolitan Police	37,961
19. Royal Irish Constabulary	739,608
20. Prisons	65,476
21. Reformatory and Industrial Schools	53,000
22. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,715
	£2,016,511"

TheCommittee divided :—Ayes, 183 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 320.)

Class IV.

5. Question put, " That a sum, not exceeding £7,110,267, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services, included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Board of Education	5,238,437
2. British Museum	90,171
3. National Gallery	7,065
4. National Portrait Gallery	2,682
5. Wallace Collection	3,539
6. Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	24,407
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	103,200
8. Public Education, Scotland	1,003,724

Ireland.

10. Public Education	633,625
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners	535
12. National Gallery	582
13. Queen's Colleges	2,300
	£7,110,267"

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 183 ; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 321.)

CLASS V.

6. Question put, “That a sum, not exceeding £1,130,288, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Diplomatic and Consular Services	303,067
2. British Protectorates in Uganda, etc.	420,700
3. Colonial Services	305,421
4. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	52,100
5. Treasury Chest Fund	49,000
	£1,130,288”

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 180 ; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 322.)

CLASS VI.

7. Question put, “That a sum, not exceeding £341,246, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Superannuation and Retired Allowances	339,729
2. Merchant Seamen’s Fund Pensions	600
3. Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances	617
4. Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	300
	£431,246”

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 181 ; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 323.)

CLASS VII.

8. Question put, “That a sum, not exceeding £63,497, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Temporary Commissions	25,000
2. Miscellaneous Expenses	5,098
3. Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	5,642
4. St. Louis Exhibition, 1904	10,000
5. Ireland Development Grant	1,000
6. Repayment to Civil Contingencies Fund	16,757
	£63,497”

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 178 ; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 324.)

Aug. 9.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

9. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,690,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Navy Services, viz. :—

	£
5. Educational Services - - - - - -	154,000
12. Admiralty Office - - - - - - -	327,400
14. Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances - - - - - -	1,208,800
	£1,690,200"

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 199 ; Noes, 44. (Division List No. 325.)

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

10. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,984,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz. :—

2. Medical Establishment, Pay, etc. - - - -	484,000
3. Militia : Pay, Bounty, etc. - - - - -	817,000
4. Imperial Yeomanry : Pay and Allowances - - -	468,000
5. Volunteer Corps : Pay and Allowances - - -	1,220,000
6. Transports and Remounts - - - - - -	1,519,000
7. Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies - - -	4,582,000
8. Clothing Establishments and Services - - -	1,156,000
10. Works, Buildings, and Repairs : Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services - - - - - - -	1,918,000
11. Establishments for Military Education - - -	146,000
12. Miscellaneous Effective Services - - - -	73,000
14. Non-effective Charges, for Officers, etc. - - -	1,666,000
15. Non-effective Charges for Men, etc. - - -	1,676,000
16. Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities - - - - -	189,000
Army (Ordnance Factories) - - - - -	70,000
	£15,984,000

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 178 ; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 326.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

11. Question put, "That a sum not exceeding £536,420, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in the Estimates for Revenue Departments, viz. :—

	£
Post Office Packet Service - - - - - -	536,420

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 179 ; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 327.)

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1902–3.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz. :—

(a.) That the gross expenditure for certain Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £388,335 5s. 7d., as shown in column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended ; while the gross expenditure for other Navy Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £437,337 3s. 0d., as shown in column No. 2 of the said appended Schedule, so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Navy Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £49,001 17s. 5d.

(b.) That the receipts in aid of certain grants for Navy Services fell short of the total estimated receipts by the sum of £4,598 15s. 4d., as shown in column No. 3 of the said appended Schedule, while the receipts in aid of other Navy Services exceeded the estimates of such receipts by a total sum of £207,119 8s. 0d., as shown in column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule, so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Navy Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £202,520 12s. 8d.

(c.) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - - -	617,270	4	0
Total Deficits - - - - - -	365,747	13	11
Net Surplus - - -	£251,522	10	1

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charges on Exchequer Grants for certain Navy Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations in Aid, in respect of the same Services ; and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services.

1. Resolved, that the Application of such sums be sanctioned.

Schedule.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1902-1903. Votes.	Gross Expenditure.		Appropriations in Aid.	
		Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure. 1.	Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure. 2.	Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 3.	Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 4.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s d.
1 ...	Wages, etc. of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines	119,682 16 6	...	...	6,668 4 6
2 ...	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy	12,203 12 7	...	...	13,090 4 0
3 ...	Medical Establishments and Services	..	4,575 15 0	1,083 0 6	
4 ...	Martial Law	437 17 5	...	45 8 7	
5 ...	Educational Services	...	4,805 11 7	...	131 18 4
6 ...	Scientific Services	...	1,215 7 8	...	2,004 3 1
7 ...	Royal Naval Reserves	...	22,764 2 1	35 6 5	
8	Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c.				
Sec. 1 ...	Personnel	188,522 13 7	...	...	1,210 7 8
Sec. 2 ...	Matériel	...	243,960 11 7	...	132,921 4 11
Sec. 3 ...	Contract Work	...	53,937 6 11	...	9,912 7 1
9 ...	Naval Armaments	...	66,440 15 5	...	37,807 9 7
10 ..	Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad	...	39,183 12 10	3,357 14 6	
11 ...	Miscellaneous Effective Services	45,859 17 4	...	...	1,183 10 4
12 ...	Admiralty Office	4,454 14 0	...	...	10 8 1
13 ...	Half-pay, Reserved and Retired Pay	...	454 19 11	...	745 8 0
14 ..	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances	6,584 9 8	...	...	1,434 2 5
15 ...	Civil Pensions and Gratuities	3,639 14 5	...	77 5 4	
	Amount written off as irrecoverable	6,949 10 1			
		388,335 5 7	437,337 3 0	4,598 15 4	207,119 8 0

Net Surplus, £49,001 17 5 Net Surplus, £202,520 12 8

Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer - - £251,522 10 1

Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz. :—

(a.) That the gross expenditure for certain Army Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £2,235,435 4s. 2d., as shown in column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Army Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £2,266,558 17s. 4d., as shown in columns No. 2 of the said appended Schedule; so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Army Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £31,123 13s. 2d.;

(b.) That the receipts in aid of certain Army Services fell short of the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £523,014 8s. 7d., as shown in Column No. 3 of the said appended Schedule; while the receipts in aid of other Army Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £938,463 11s. 9d., as shown in Column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule; so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Army Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £415,449 3s. 2d.;

(c.) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - - -	2,613,888	15	8
Total Deficits- - - - - -	2,167,115	19	4
Net Surplus - - - -	£446,572	16	4

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge as Exchequer Grants for certain Army Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriation in Aid, in respect of the same Services, and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services

2. Resolved, that the application of such sums be sanctioned.

Schedule.

Number of Vote	Army Services, 1902–1903. Votes.	Gross Expenditure.		Appropriations-in Aid.	
		Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure. 1.	Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure. 2.	Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 3.	Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 4.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s d.	£ s. d.
1	Pay, etc., of Army (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments) -	...	1,028,191 3 0	...	7,958 15 7
2	Medical Establishments : Pay, etc. - -	...	31,748 10 7	...	10,727 19 10
3	Militia : Pay, Bounty, etc. - - - -	324,011 2 9	...	612 7 11	
4	Imperial Yeomanry : Pay and Allowances -	...	248,246 2 10	...	73 1 2
5	Volunteer Corps : Pay and Allowances -	23,391 15 2	...	...	1,672 1 3
6	Transport and Remounts - - - -	624,534 10 4	...	246,678 7 6	
7	Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies -	...	359,562 0 7	67,354 14 9	
8	Clothing Establishments, and Services -	...	402,078 19 10	...	207,828 6 10
9	Warlike and other Stores : Supply and Repair - - - - - - - -	...	182,606 9 3	27,700 12 3	
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs : Cost, including staff for Engineer Services -	670,280 2 6	...	...	185,595 14 1
11	Establishments for Military Education -	4,591 15 2	...	...	5,321 7 7
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	291,872 9 5	...	...	519,286 5 5
13	War Office : Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges - - - - - - -	34,424 0 10	...	120 0 4	
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, etc. -	253,696 5 1	...	68,069 3 9	
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, etc.	...	12,532 1 6	112,464 17 1	
16	Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances - - - -	...	1,593 9 9	14 5 0	
	Balances irrecoverable - - -	8,633 2 11			
		2,235,435 4 2	2,266,558 17 4	523,014 8 7	938,463 11 9
		Net Surplus, £31,123 13 2		Net Surplus, £415,449 3 2	

Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer - £446,572 16 4

Mr. Charles Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) 1677
Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1680
The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford*) .. 1681
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1682

Aug. 9.] Page

Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1683
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (*Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield*) 1684
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1686
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1687

Resolutions to be reported this day.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.] .. .. ..

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, the sum of £73,083,164 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1689
Mr. MacVeagh (*Down, S.*) 1689

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 126 ; Noes, 33. (Division List No. 328.)

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Indian Councils Bill. [SECOND READING].—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [1st June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford*) .. 1691
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 1692
Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 1692

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1693
Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 1693
Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory) 1693
Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N,) 1694
Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) 1694
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 1694
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 1694

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 36; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 329.)

Clause 1.

Mr. Charles Hobhouse 1695
Mr. MacVeagh 1697
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1698

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 35. (Division List No. 330.)

Clause 2.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 35. (Division List No. 331.)

Schedule.

Mr. Higham (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby) 1701

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, to leave out lines 6 to 9, inclusive."—(*Mr. Higham.*)

Question proposed, "That the lines proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

Mr. MacVeagh 1701
Mr. Delany 1702
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 1702
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1703
Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby) 1703
Mr. Doogan (Tyrone) 1704
Mr. MacVeagh 1705

Aug. 9.] *Page*

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. MacVeagh.*)

Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 1705
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1705

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill [LORDS].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1706

Justices of the Peace Bill [LORDS].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1706

False Statements (Companies) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1706

Naval and Military Medals Bill [LORDS].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1706

Public Health Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow 1706

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill [LORDS].—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; Bill read the third time, and passed 1706

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 2) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow 1706

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes before Four o'clock, a.m.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXXXIX.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
FOURTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 29*th* *July*, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Rotherham Coporation Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Selby Urban District Council Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Emly be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Armstrong; read, and agreed to.

Swindon Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Aberdeen City Improvements — Was presented by the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*); read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (the Lord Kintor (*E. Kintore*)); and reported from the Committee. (No. 168.)

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 169). A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Ayr Corporation Tramways; and

Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 170). A

An Asterisk (*) *at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Glasgow Corporation (Sewage)—Were presented by the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*) (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Sections 8 and 9); read 1ª; and to be printed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3240. United States (Savannah).
No. 3241. Paraguay.
No. 3242. Japan (North Formosa).

IMPERIAL DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

Treasury Minute, dated 4th May, 1904, as to Secretariat.

TRAMWAYS ACT, 1870.

Report by the Board of Trade of their proceedings under the Tramways Act, 1870, during the session of 1904.

METROPOLITAN GAS COMMITTEE.

Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to gas-testing in the Metropolis. Part II. Evidence and Appendices.

ROYAL OBSERVATORY, GREENWICH.

Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich.

WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOUR, BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT).

Report on changes in rates of wages and hours of labour in the United Kingdom in 1903; with comparative statistics for 1894–1902.

STATISTICS

Statistical abstract for the principal and other foreign countries in each year from 1892 to 1901–1902 (as far as the particulars can be stated). Thirtieth Number.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Report on American manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain. Volume I.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.

Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ended the 30th June, 1904.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF HERTFORD).

Orders made by the County Council of the county of Hertford, re-dividing into polling districts—

The Eastern or Hertford Parliamentary Division; The Mid or St. Albans Parliamentary Division.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

FINANCE BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1.

Standing Order No. XXXIX. considered (according to order).

Moved, "That the said Standing Order be suspended for this day's sitting."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, last night I thought it my duty in the very few words I then addressed to the House to protest as strongly as I could against the action of His Majesty's Government in bringing up a Bill of this great importance at so late a period of the session, and in compelling this House, or trying to compel this House, to pass it through all its stages in the course of an hour or two. I said that I should repeat my protest to-day, and I think that this is the proper time, when the suspension of the Standing Order is moved, that I should do so. This is not the first time that I have protested against Bills being brought up from the other House for your Lordships' consideration at the very fag end of the session, but the present is one of the greatest scandals in this respect that I can recollect.

Let me just describe what has occurred. We came here to-day without having any intimation on our Votes that we were to discuss this Bill. We had it foreshadowed in two facts. First, there was the fact that we were to meet at the unusual hour of three o'clock instead of a quarter past four; and, secondly, there was the fact that the Standing Order which prevents the several stages of a Bill being taken the same day was to be suspended. That was the only notice we had on the Votes of the House as to this Bill being brought before your Lordships' House to-day. After our arrival this afternoon we observed some communication going on at the Bar between the Clerk at the Table and a gentleman whom we know represents the House of Commons, and presently a Paper was brought to the Table tied up in green silk. We subsequently learned that this was the Bill which has lately been passed in the House of Commons—the Finance Bill; and, thereupon, the noble Marquess the Leader of the House moved that it be read a first time. Now, my Lords, that is a very strong order indeed. Your Lordships are obliged to discuss a Bill of the greatest national importance without having notice of it on your Votes. Peers who look at their Votes to see what is coming on in your Lordships' House would not know, unless they learned it from another source, that this Bill was to be brought up.

We all know that we in this House cannot amend a Money Bill, but we have a perfect right to discuss it, and a full right to throw it out if we so will. I need hardly say that I am not going to propose that the Finance Bill should be thrown out, but I do claim the right of this House to discuss a measure of this great importance. Why is it that the Government have taken this course and placed your Lordships in this most undignified position? It is stated that the Bill must become law before 1st August, and therefore, as the House of Commons does not sit to-day later than half-past five or six and does not sit on Saturday, the Government wish your Lordships' House to pass it through all its stages, if possible, within one hour, so that the Commons may be summoned to hear the Royal Assent given to it. I very much doubt the pressing necessity for passing the Bill through your Lordships' House in this hurried manner. I have in my hand a "Manual of Procedure in the Public Business of the House of Commons," prepared by the Clerk of that House, and in Article 239 I find these words—

> "When the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made his annual financial statement, he moves, in Committee of Ways and Means, the Resolutions required for continuing, imposing, remitting, or reducing taxes, or otherwise regulating the collection of the revenue. These Resolutions require confirmation by Parliament, but when any such Resolution is to take effect at once it is, by usage, brought into operation as soon as it has been passed by the Committee of Ways and Means."

These Resolutions, as a rule, name 1st August as the day to which they refer, but I find that has not always been the practice.

Though 1st August has been named as the day when the Resolution comes to an end, and when it requires confirmation by Parliament, that has not always been followed by the immediate passing of the Finance Bill. By Section 1 of the Finance Act, 1895, the tea duty was continued till 1st August, 1896. By Section 1 of the Finance Act, 1896, the tea duty was continued from 1st August of that year to 1st August, 1897; but the Finance Act of 1896 did not receive the Royal Assent until 7th August. I would ask His Majesty's Government to explain why, in face of that fact, it is now necessary to force this Bill through by 1st August. I submit that there is no case for such action. If, however, the contention of the Government that the Bill must receive the Royal Assent before 1st August is correct, then I think they are open to very grave censure for not having arranged their business in such a way as to allow of this measure coming before your Lordships at an earlier period, so that we might have proper time to consider it. It certainly strikes me that the system of conducting business in the other House must be exceedingly careless when such a thing as that against which I am protesting can happen.

I would remind your Lordships that it was not always so. In 1894, when the Liberal Government was in power, the Finance Bill was read a first time on 19th July, and a second time on 26th July. It was committed on 27th July, and read a third time on 30th July. And that Bill, it should be remembered, embodied the great system of death duties with which the name of my right hon. friend Sir William Harcourt is so intimately connected. In 1895 the Bill was read a first time on 27th May; the Second Reading was on the 28th, and the Royal Assent was given on the 30th. In 1896 the Finance Bill was read a first time on 30th July; it was read a second time and passed through the remaining stages on 4th August without discussion. In 1901 the First Reading was taken on 18th July; it was read a second time and the Committee negatived on 23rd July and the Bill was read a third time on the 25th. In 1902 the Bill was read a first time on 26th June—a much earlier period; the Second Reading was taken on 3rd July, and the Third Reading on 4th July. In 1903 the Bill was read a first time on 25th July, and on 29th July it went through its remaining stages. The Government have managed their affairs in the House of Commons in what I venture to think is an exceedingly slovenly way, and in a way that has placed your Lordships' House in a very difficult and serious position. It is impossible for this House to debate a great measure of this kind in the circumstances in which we stand, and I strongly protest against the suspension of the Standing Order as proposed.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I sympathise with a great deal that has been said by the noble Earl. It has been the subject of debate more than once that Bills come up from the other House in circumstances which make it impossible for your Lordships to discuss them. I do not feel as strongly as the noble Earl does on this particular occasion, because, although I agree that three stages were taken as a matter of form on the occasions to which he has referred, I doubt whether the noble Earl will find that there was much debate.

*EARL SPENCER: On one occasion I made a speech of considerable length, and other noble Lords on this side have spoken.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I was speaking of what has been the common practice. On a great many occasions it has been a mere matter of form. I lament it very much, and I think the noble Marquess the Leader of the House will lament it too. There are times when there are great debates in the House of Commons, and it is impossible to hurry them; and it has been with great exertions and at some cost to health that even now this Bill has been brought before your Lordships. I quite understand that if the Resolution had been reserved to a later period the difficulty would not have arisen, but the Resolution limited the period to 1st August.

*EARL SPENCER: It did the same in 1896.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: All I can say is that, apart from that Resolution, I do not know what power there was to collect any taxes whatever after 1st August. That is one of the problems which I confess I cannot solve. If there was no real power to do it, no one knew anything about it, and the taxes were collected in the ordinary course; but they had no right to do it after the determination of that period. That is the condition in which we are, and I think this House is not responsible for it. It is a state of things that does sometimes occur, and I have very often expressed the feelings which the noble Earl has given utterance to on occasions when there really was something to discuss. and when, at the end of the session, we were informed that, although there were some matters in a Bill which were obviously erroneous, its going back to the Commons would be fatal to it, and we have been compelled to accept the Bill. I have more than once thought that it would be much more convenient if some of the Bills of a public character were initiated in this House. I hope the noble Lord will not himself take a course which could only result in public inconvenience or encourage his followers to do so. Whatever has been done on previous occasions, when nobody knew anything at all about it, now that the noble Lord has called attention to the determination of the period on 1st August, somebody will find out that he need not pay any tax on that date. I ask your Lordships not to resort to extreme measures on this occasion, and I hope the difficulty will not occur again.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I do not wish to enter into the question as to this Bill becoming law before 1st August. Whatever questions may arise in consequence of this being a Finance Bill, I hope your Lordships will think that we are justified in taking advantage of this opportunity to make a clear and distinct protest against the way in which this House is treated. As my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack has said, he has been very emphatic in his condemnation of this practice, which is really having a most serious effect. I would remind your Lordships of what occurred recently in the case of the Factory Bill. That Bill effected more than 100 amendments in the law, and there were Members in your Lordships' House most qualified and most anxious to deal with that subject; yet Lord Belper, who had charge of the Bill, had to announce that if this House made one single Amendment in it, there was not time for the House of Commons to consider it, and the Bill would be lost. There were some Members of your Lordships' House who were prepared to say that, in the circumstances, the Bill should not pass; but my noble friend on the Woolsack and I made a most pressing appeal to your Lordships not to punish the operatives who would be affected by the rejection of the Bill. The Bill was passed, but your Lordships' hands were so tied that you were unable to make the slightest Amendment. The late Lord Salisbury, who had the honour of this House at heart as much as any man, joined in deploring this state of things—a state of things which I venture to think ought never to exist. The majority of the House of Commons desire to see this House continue in its strength; but if we submit to be treated as if we were nobodies, if we are not to bear an equal responsibility with the House of Commons in legislation, the time will come soon enough when others will think of us as we allow ourselves to be thought of, and the country will tell us that we are a Chamber without utility and without influence in the country.

This is not a question affecting this Government only; it is a habit that has grown up. Although the difficulties that exist in the House of Commons in carrying business through may drive a Minister to take a course which he cannot always control, surely some effort should be made to allow us to take a greater part in the responsibility of legislation. Why is it that in this session not one measure of the slightest importance has been initiated in this House? Why should we be treated as if we were incapable of dealing with these questions? By the action of the other House there has been taken from us the possibility of our doing anything. I do not blame this Government particularly, or individual members of it; but surely everyone who desires to see this House honoured and its utility maintained ought to take every opportunity of protesting against the course that has been pursued towards it.

The EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I venture to associate myself with the protest which has just been made by the noble and learned Lord. I speak not so much with reference to this Bill, because I do not suppose there is any noble Lord likely to move its rejection, but with reference to the precedent which is created, and because, so far as I know, it has never before been stated in this House that a Bill brought in at three o'clock must be passed through all its stages by half-past five.

A NOBLE LORD: By four o'clock.

The EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: It is perfectly true that in the Orders of the Day the Commission is announced to sit at four o'clock to give the Royal Assent to this Bill; but, as a matter of fact, your Lordships are given till half-past five—namely, two and a half hours—in which to discuss this Bill. This is the strongest practical illustration that I can imagine of the necessity for the protest which was raised by Lord Newton last year, and which has been repeated this year, with reference to the management of the business of this House, and the way in which this House is treated during the last fortnight or three weeks of the session. When the noble Lord opposite (Lord Newton) introduced his Motion I added a few words, giving my own experience of the last three weeks of the session in this House. If any noble Lord attends this House at all, the last three weeks of the session is the time for him to attend. There is very little business to transact before then. Shoals of Bills are presented to this House during the last three weeks of the session, and with regard to them appeals are made, such as the noble and learned Lord opposite told us were made in the case of the Factory Bill, and noble Lords are implored to withdraw all opposition.

The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has to-night made a speech of a very apologetic character. He agrees with a great deal of what was said earlier by the noble Lord who leads the Opposition, and I believe he agrees with a great deal of what I am saying now, and with what Lord Newton has said in former debates; but it is not merely sympathy that we want. Sympathy is a very fine thing in its way, but what we want is some practical illustration of that sympathy. During the remaining two or three weeks of the session Bills will be brought up here, and we shall be adjured to pass them without being given any opportunity whatever of amending them or even of considering them. This House has before now postponed the consideration of a Bill on the ground that there was no time to take it into consideration. Such a Motion was made by the late Lord Redesdale. It was a Scottish Education Bill or something of that sort which originated in this House. It was largely altered in the other House, and was brought up again to this House about the 9th or 10th of August. Lord Redesdale moved that it was then too late to consider those Amendments, and the House affirmed his opinion by, I think, a majority of something like twenty votes. I hold that with regard to Bills which may be brought up to this House during the remaining weeks of the present session, noble Lords who really wish to show that they attach some practical value to the independence of this House, and to its taking a proper part in legislation, would be acting perfectly within their rights in moving to postpone the consideration of the Bills then brought up. I cannot understand why it is not possible to introduce more Bills in this House. The noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack said it would be a good thing if that were done.

LORD NEWTON: The Licensing Bill, for instance.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I was going to ask the noble and learned Lord whether he would not intercede with the noble Marquess the Leader of this House, and get some Bills initiated here. It is not sufficient to say one wishes to see them introduced; some practical steps should be taken to get them introduced. I believe the Licensing Bill, which has just been referred to by my noble friend Lord Newton, was eminently a Bill for consideration by this House. It would have been wholly unnecessary to interfere with any part of the compensation or money clauses, but I venture to say that in this House most valuable debates would have taken place with regard to the principle of the Bill. If the Bill had been introduced in your Lordships' House, I believe it would have been almost as forward in the House of Commons as it is at the present time, and your Lordships would have had ample time for its consideration. I wish to renew my protest against the way in which your Lordships' House is treated during the last three weeks of the session, and this is going to be one of the very worst sessions in that respect. I cannot remember a Bill ever being forced down our throats in a period which may be an hour, and which must not be more than two and a half hours. It is the most practical application of the guillotine that I ever remember. I hope the noble Marquess, who has at heart the honour and the dignity of this House, and who leads the House with such universal approval, will bear in mind the rights and privileges of this House, and will in the next session of Parliament, at all events, set a better example than has been set during the present session in the way of introducing Bills in this House.

*Lord COLERIDGE: My Lords, your Lordships' House is in rather a peculiar position, because we are asked to pass a Bill which no Member of this House has ever seen. What mischief may lurk under that green silk band I know not, but at any rate, until the Bill is seen we cannot reasonably be asked to pass it. Let me remind the House of the manner in which matters have been conducted by His Majesty's Government. The Committee stage of the Finance Bill began in the other House on 20th June. The Prime Minister said it was absolutely necessary—and I presume he did not say that without some grounds—that the Bill should be taken on 20th June, and no later, and that it should be discussed *de die in diem*. It was discussed on the 20th, 21st, and the 22nd of June. Then, my Lords, there was a gap, and the House of Commons heard no more of the Bill until 18th July. Now, with what face, speaking respectfully, with what excuse can the noble Marquess come to this House and plead for urgency when His Majesty's Government have not used the expedition that might have been used in the other House?

One of the weeks during which there was this suspension of discussion on the Finance Bill was occupied with Ascot. Will the noble Marquess say that that was an adequate reason for suspending any discussion on the financial business of the country? Another week or fortnight of that period was occupied with the Licensing Bill. Now that Bill is a very important measure; but, after all, no Bill is so important as the Bill which enables the Government to levy taxes. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister, if the truth were known, felt that he was more secure of his majority on the Licensing Bill than he was at that particular time on the Finance Bill, because the Licensing Bill affected great interests, and the interests of the many are apt to be overlooked in the interests of the few. The noble Marquess cannot say that the Government have shown that despatch of business which entitles him to come and ask us to pass through all its stages a Bill we have not seen.

I do not know what the awful consequences to the Government will be if we do not pass this Bill through in the allotted time. The noble Earl on the Woolsack thinks no taxpayer need pay in the interval between the ceasing of the operation of the Resolution passed by the House of Commons and the coming into force of the statutory measure authorising the levying of the tax. I do not know how that would be; but there is one simple way out of the difficulty. The Government have a vast majority in the House of Commons and a still larger majority in this House, and no delay need accompany the passing of a Bill of indemnity. I have no doubt it would be carried by acclamation in both Houses. When, for instance, in South Africa acts were done under martial law which the civil law did not recognise, it was found necessary to pass Acts of Indemnity, and these were passed without opposition. That is an excellent precedent for this country; and it seems to me that the difficulty might be got over in that way, and that, therefore, the need for this speedy passing of the Bill is not so urgent as the noble Marquess would lead us to believe.

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, I cannot understand why the noble Marquess, in asking us to suspend the Standing Order, did not give us reasons why this is necessary, because it does seem to me that in taking the course proposed His Majesty's Government are establishing a precedent. My noble and learned friend behind me has reminded the House that we have not even been permitted to see the Bill which we are asked to pass through all its stages to-day. His Majesty's Government appear to have taken the view that as this Finance Bill is introduced with the authority of a Conservative Government, therefore it is one which does not excite any question of public interest. Reference was made by the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition to what took place in regard to the Finance Bill which introduced the death duties; and I cannot help thinking that if this House acts on the principle involved in this Resolution it would be perfectly possible for any Government, a Liberal Government perhaps, to introduce proposals of a most stringent and radical character into a Finance Bill, embodying principles opposed to the view of the predominant Party in this House, and by deferring the date demand the rapid passage of such a Bill through all its stages to avoid the disorganisation of the financial arrangements of the country.

I, with all deference to what has been said, very much doubt if any serious financial disturbance would arise through not acceding to the proposal of His Majesty's Government. It is absurd to suppose that the Bill now before the House has not in it great questions of principle. If it did not contain such questions, on what conceivable grounds did the House of Commons debate it at such length? It is said that the opposition in the House of Commons was purely obstructive; but I would point out that upon the question of protection—which I hope I and others will have an opportunity of discussing later this afternoon when the Second Reading is moved—a great deal of the opposition to the Bill came from the Ministerial side of the House. I do contend that if your Lordships' House is to be considered an independent Second Chamber, it is desirable that we should take some stand to maintain our rights. If this Assembly is to be looked upon merely as a sort of adjunct to the Carlton Club it is perfectly intelligible, and in itself intelligent, that Bills of this kind should be brought up when introduced by Conservative Governments, and that we should be asked to accept them without any discussion or deliberation at all. In moving that the Standing Order be suspended, the noble Marquess did not say a single word in explanation of, or justification for, that Motion. It is presumed that your Lordships will do exactly as the Government ask, that you will suspend the Standing Order without debate, and pass the Bill through all its stages, so that it may receive the Royal Assent before the adjournment of the House of Commons. Although it may seem somewhat strange that noble Lords on this side of the House should stand up in defence of the rights of this Assembly, yet it does seem to me that so long as the House of Lords exists, and so long as the members of the Opposition are obliged to sit in an Assembly in which they are in a considerable minority, they should be treated with a semblance of respect and consideration.

Lord NEWTON: My Lords, it is with some gratification that I have heard from noble Lords who have spoken this afternoon sentiments which I have myself expressed on previous occasions, but I confess to feeling considerable regret that these sentiments have not been expressed earlier. When on a recent occasion I drew attention to the state of business in this House, not only did nobody say a word in support of my contention, but the Leader of the House, amid the plaudits of the Assembly, pointed out to me that there was practically no hope of ameliorating the condition of things, and that we must be content to exist in our present circumstances. I rise more for the purpose of endeavouring to show, if I can, that the Prime Minister is not so much to blame as he is supposed to be. I will admit that at first blush it looks as if this House had been treated with extreme contempt, I might almost say contumely, by the Prime Minister, because he has left the discussion of the Finance Bill over until the last possible date, and if the contention of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack is correct, has left us with at the most two and a half hours for discussing this Bill, and passing it through all its stages. I cannot help wondering what would have been said by our Party if we had had to endure this at the hands of the Party opposite.

But, as I say, I am anxious to make the best case I can for the Prime Minister, and to prove, if possible, that he is not so black as he has been painted, and I will do it by asking the Leader of the House whether it is not the case that under the old Finance Act power is taken to levy duties up to 1st August, and that it is not absolutely necessary for the present Bill to become law at this sitting. 1st August is next Monday, and, so far as I am aware, the old Finance Act is in operation until 1st August. The new Bill will come into operation on 1st August, and there will be no interval between the two. I wish to ask the noble Marquess the Leader of the House whether I am correct in this assumption; and, if I am, there is obviously no necessity for passing the Bill through all its stages during the present sitting.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, the only reply I am able to give to the noble Lord is that we are advised that the course he suggests is not one which could be adopted consistently with the provisions of the Act of Parliament. I rise really with the object of adding my expressions of regret to those of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack at being obliged to ask your Lordships to take so unusual a course with regard to this Bill. There is a consensus of opinion on this subject, and I do not dissociate myself in any way from what has been said as to the inconvenience of passing Bills of this importance so hurriedly through your Lordships' House. I should, however, like to notice for one moment the remark of the noble Earl opposite that this result might have been avoided, if it had not been for what he called the slovenly manner in which business had been conducted in the House of Commons. I find that the discussion of this Bill occupied seventeen days in the House of Commons, or three and a half weeks of Parliamentary time; and although I feel that I am scarcely in a position to carry the war into the enemy's country, I would ask him whether some of the delay that has taken place may not be attributed to the extreme anxiety shown by the noble Earl's friends to discuss not only this measure, but other measures which have been simultaneously before the House of Commons.

As to the position of your Lordships' House in reference to money Bills I do not think there is any controversy. It is open to us, if we like, to throw out a money Bill. It is, I believe, even open to us, if we choose, to amend it. I believe there is a case on record where an Amendment was actually inserted; but as a matter of practical politics we all know that the insertion of an important Amendment in a money Bill by this House would lead to the abandonment of the measure when it went back to the other House. Therefore we may regard the insertion of an Amendment as equivalent to the rejection of the Bill. The case is different when we come to the question of discussion. When the noble Earl claims for this House the right of discussing a money Bill at length, it is rather interesting to recall cases when we on this side of the House have upheld this doctrine, and it has been disputed by noble Lords opposite. The noble Earl referred to a debate which took place in 1894 on the Finance Bill of that year. If he will refer to that debate he will see that Lord Rosebery deprecated altogether the idea that the House of Lords should have anything to do with money Bills. In those days, therefore, noble Lords opposite took a different view, and we appeared as champions of the rights of the House of Lords. I have no doubt some allowance must be made for the different conditions under which the subject is approached according as we sit on one side or other of the House. I am not familiar with the precedent to which the noble Earl referred, but it certainly is the case that, in the Act of last year, it is clearly and distinctly laid down that certain taxes shall continue to be charged, levied, or paid until the first day of August this year, and in our view that does render it necessary that the new legislation should come into effect before the arrival of that day.

*EARL SPENCER: August was also mentioned in the Act of 1895, but the Act of 1896 did not become law until 7th August. The same conditions obtained then.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Even assuming that that was so, it does not follow that the transaction was regular, or that it is desirable to repeat it on the present occasion, There is one suggestion which I would make to the noble Earl. I quite admit the desirability of discussing in this House the financial position of the country, and the great problems which arise in connection with it. But is it quite clear that it is only upon the introduction of the Finance Bill that discussions of that kind can take place? It always seems to me to be rather astonishing that we in your Lordships' House, whose time, after all, is not so fully occupied, should not avail ourselves of the opportunities which are within our reach for raising what it seems to me would be extremely useful discussions upon such questions as the financial position of the country. I have heard it said, very recently, that it is only in the House of Lords that full opportunities are really given for such discussion. I do not see why the noble Lord or any of his friends should not at any moment, had they desired it, have initiated a debate on the general financial prospects of the country. I did not, however, rise for the purpose of disputing what was said by the noble Lord opposite as to the inconvenience complained of. On the contrary, I may assure your Lordships that we shall make it our business to prevent a recurrence of a state of things similar to that which we are discussing this evening. We have taken already one step which, it seems to me, is a practical one in that direction, because in the Bill of this year we have substituted for the date of the 1st of August the 1st of July, so that there will at any rate be a little more elbow room another year. I can assure your Lordships that I am deeply concerned for the honour of your Lordships' House, and that I should be the last person in the world to desire that any slight or indignity should be offered to it.

Lord BURGHCLERE: My Lords, I shall only interpose for a few minutes in this discussion. I have heard a rumour that some of my friends are proposing to take a division on the Motion now before the House. On an ordinary occasion I would be the last man in the world to register my vote against a request by the responsible Government of the day to suspend certain Standing Orders in order to enable them to carry on the Government, but if there is an occasion in which we ought not to take the situation in which we are placed lying down I think this is the occasion, and if my noble friends go to a division I shall certainly join them in the Lobby. It is perfectly true that your Lordships have no power to amend a money Bill, but we have the power to end it, and if we never attempt to exercise that power it seems to me that it would be better that Finance Bills should never be referred to this House at all. That would make the course of the Government a great deal easier, and I think it would place us in a position of greater dignity than we are in on the present unfortunate occasion. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech on this subject, but only to explain my own position in regard to the matter. In order to register my protest against the position in which we are continually being placed year after year at this period of the session, when it is quite impossible for your Lordships to discuss the various Bills that are sent up with a proper sense of your own dignity, I shall, if my noble friends divide upon this Motion, follow them into the Division Lobby.

Earl CARRINGTON: My Lords, I should like to be permitted to say a word or two on this subject, on which I feel very strongly. I am certain every noble Lord on this side of the House will receive in the way in which it was meant the expression of regret which emanated from the noble Marquess the Leader of the House on account of the *impasse* in which your Lordships find yourselves. As I understand this matter, if this Bill is not passed by Monday next the taxes which are now being levied under the Resolutions passed by the House of Commons will be illegally levied, because the old Act of 1903 only gave the Crown power to levy the taxes sanctioned by the Resolutions of the House of Commons up to 1st August. If, therefore, the Government continued to levy these taxes without the Resolutions having been confirmed by the Bill before the House, they would have to have recourse to a Bill of Indemnity.

When I first landed in New South Wales in 1883 the Government were turned out within seven days; another Prime Minister and Government were elected, but they only remained in office a fortnight. Then there was a third Government which lasted six weeks. These changes had one advantage, inasmuch as they made the Governor acquainted with almost every politician of any standing in the colony; but they had this great disadvantage, that very little public business could be done, and one result was that the different Oppositions had a playful habit of refusing supplies. The Leader of the Opposition in each case did the best he could to obtain supplies for the Government, but miserably failed in that laudable endeavour, and the result was that all the Ministerial salaries and the different salaries in the colony were paid by monthly

Supply Bills. Of course, that was illegal, and it had to be remedied, when the staple Government came in, by Bills of Indemnity. Therefore, if this Bill is not passed by next Monday I take it that the taxes that will be levied will be illegally levied, and the Government will have to have recourse to a Bill of Indemnity. No doubt that would take some time to pass the House of Commons, and it would delay public business, but it would not be the fault of the Opposition. The Government ought to have thought of that before.

I submit that it is not respectful to this House to bring in a Bill at the last moment, and, as it were, to force it down the throats of your Lordships. The noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack spoke of the public inconvenience that would be caused if the Government did not get this Bill by 1st August. He concluded with a most pathetic appeal to your Lordships not to say anything this time, and he was good enough to assure us that such a thing should not happen again. With all respect, I submit that the procedure of the Government in the case of this Bill is not an isolated case. It is part of the systematically contemptuous manner in which this Government has treated Parliament, relying on the support of a majority which was elected on a false issue. That is the real reason why the House of Lords is placed in the present position. This majority, I repeat, was elected on a false issue, and they have received abundant proof of the displeasure of the constituencies in the country. As I believe this is the real reason of the present deadlock, perhaps I may be allowed to say a word or two on these false issues. They have a distinct bearing on this Bill and on the finances of the country. I would remind the House that Mr. Balfour said in Manchester in 1900——

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: May I venture to remind the noble Earl that the Motion before the House is that the Standing Order be suspended for this day's sitting? I think my noble friend's observations are scarcely germane to that Motion.

EARL CARRINGTON: I am entirely in the hands of the House, but I do most respectfully submit that this is a matter of the gravest importance. Seeing how small numerically is the band of Liberal Peers in this House, I do think that some little consideration and some little latitude might be allowed to us when we are standing up, not only for the rights of this House, but for what we think are the rights of the country at large.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I rise to a point of order. I gathered that my noble friend was showing that we are in this position owing to the incapacity of the Government to administer the affairs of the country in the House of Commons. He was giving instances to show their incapacity in that direction. Surely that is in order.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: The noble Earl is mistaken. The topic was the false issues raised before the constituencies at the last election, and I think it will require some ingenuity to bring that within the present discussion.

EARL CARRINGTON: It is, I contend, these false issues which have brought about the present deadlock; but, as I said a moment ago, I am entirely in the hands of the House, and if the House wishes for some reason that this debate should not go on, I will bow to that decision. But I do, at the same time, enter the strongest possible protest against not being permitted to go into this subject, which I consider, though I may be wrong, to be entirely germane to the matter before the House. The position in which we are now placed is, perhaps, the last instance of the systematic dictation of His Majesty's Government to both Houses of Parliament. I understand that the original proposal was that we should have met last night at midnight as soon as the Bill had passed through the House of Commons. I suppose that some noble Lords would have been sent down at half-past twelve or one o'clock in the morning, armed with a big revolver, to point it at the devoted heads of the few members of the Opposition who were present, telling them in plain language that they were to pass the Bill. Owing, however, to the protest made not only by noble Lords who sit on this side of the House but by the noble Lords who generally support the

Government, that course was not persisted in. I ask whether it is right, whether it is decent, to ask the House to rush this Bill through all its stages in the course of a few minutes? There is one great reason why this particular Bill should have fair and proper discussion. It is the first Budget savouring of protection which has been introduced into Parliament for the last fifty years.

On Question,

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 31; Not-contents, 11.

CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Argyll, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.

Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E.
Cromer, E.

Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Lauderdale, E.
Lucan, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Sidmouth, V.

Balfour, L.
Belper, L.

Clonbrock, L.
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
James, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*) [*Teller.*]
Macnaghten, L.
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Raglan, L
Robertson, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Beauchamp, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Crewe, E.

Portsmouth, E. [*Teller.*]

Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)

Burghclere, L.

Coleridge, L. [*Teller.*]
Emly, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Shuttleworth, L.

Standing Order No. XXXIX. having been suspended, Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

*Lord COLERIDGE: My Lords, I desire to say a few words on the Motion now before the House. The occasion is one on which I think it is not immaterial to draw some attention to the growing expenditure of the country. The figures are somewhat startling. There are two reasons why I think attention should be drawn to the Budget—firstly, because of the growing expenditure of the country, and, secondly, because, as my noble friend Lord Carrington in his concluding words told us, for the first time for fifty years the Budget discloses taxation of a protective character. Without going any further into reasons, that is sufficient reason of itself why we on this side of the House at any rate think it right to draw public attention to the nature of the Budget of this financial year.

The expenditure to which I would draw attention is of a most alarming character. In 1894, when the Liberal Government were last in power, the expenditure upon the Navy and Army together did not equal the expenditure on either one of those branches now; that is to say, the present expenditure on either of these services exceeds the total expenditure on both branches demanded by the Government in 1894. Now, my Lords, does that correspond with either the increase in the population or the increase in the wealth of the inhabitants of the country? It corresponds with neither. It is an enormous advance in the weight of taxation upon every individual member of the community. To show how this expenditure has been growing, I may mention that between the years 1894 and 1899, the first five years of the Conservative Government, there was an increase in the annual expenditure of the country of £15,000,000 sterling. That was a large increase and one calculated to make every man who had financial economy at heart pause and reflect; but it was as nothing compared with the corresponding increase since the year 1899. From 1899 to 1904 in addition to that £15,000,000, we are now faced with an extra expenditure of £35,000,000 a year. Every financial authority on either side of the House, of whatever economic or political opinion, is agreed that this is a dangerous state of affairs and cannot be permitted to continue without risk to the financial stability of the country.

I am discussing a Bill that I have never seen, but I assume, from the form in which the Finance Bill was reported to the House of Commons after it had been amended in Committee, that there is an increased tax of 2d. placed upon tea. Let me first deal with the question of tea, which is, after all, one of the most innocuous and essential elements of food. It is a drink that everyone must wish well to, that everyone must desire should be shared as largely and as economically as possible by the whole population. It is an article of necessity which everyone who has the interests of the poorer people at heart would desire to relieve as far as possible from any burden of taxation which would tend to increase its price. The tea duty was increased from 4d. to 6d. by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and it was increased, as he stated at the time, not as a permanent tax. He thus described the reasons for its imposition —

> "This extra 2d. is purely, in my opinion, an exceptional tax levied for the purposes of the present war."

Therefore, my Lords, the financial authority for the time being of His Majesty's Government, in asking the House of Commons and the country to accept his Budget, admitted the grave result of putting an extra tax of 2d. a lb. on such an article of necessity as tea. He excused it on the ground that it was a temporary tax imposed for a temporary purpose, leaving everyone to infer, as this House and the House of Commons did infer, that when that temporary necessity had passed away the temporary tax would be remitted.

The war is over and we are in times of peace, but this year His Majesty's Government, instead of not remitting the 2d. in the £ that was imposed by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach for the purposes of the war, are actually adding another 2d., bringing the tax upon tea up to 8d. per lb. Having regard to the price of tea in the market, that is an extraordinary proportion. It is 75 or 80 per cent. of the whole price of the tea in the market. I need hardly say that that is a great burden upon the people, and for such a tax some unusual and unprecedented reason ought to be forthcoming. Take the income-tax, which is felt by the rich, and particularly by those persons who are between rich and poor, viz., the professional classes who are hoping to put enough money away to provide for old age. The income-tax was 8d. in the £. It was raised during the war in the same circumstances, the same reasons being given for its increase, to the amount of 1s. 3d. Mr. Ritchie, after the war was over, remitted 4d. of that tax. The income-tax then stood at 11d.—a high rate, but still a substantial reduction as compared with the 1s. 3d. that had been imposed as a temporary war tax. Now, what does the present Chancellor of the Exchequer do in regard to income-tax in the Budget before us? This is, as I say, a time of peace. Not content to permit the income-tax to remain at 11d. he adds another 1d. to it, with the result that the income-tax now stands at 1s. Altogether the taxation of the country since the year 1894 has increased by 57 per cent.

Now, if I take the ten years between 1892 and 1902 I find the following figures most eloquent of the state of things to which a long course of His Majesty's Government has reduced the financial condition of the country. The increase in expenditure has been more than four times the increase in population; that is to say, we ought to be four times as rich as we were ten years ago if the taxation of the country is to be borne with equivalent sacrifice on the part of the taxpayer. The normal expenditure of the country has increased by £49,000,000 a year since the Conservative Government came into office in 1895. I do not pretend to be a financier, but I am sufficiently acquainted with figures to understand these, and I ask noble Lords whether they do not think these figures disclose a state of things at which every lover of his country ought to feel somewhat alarmed. Will the noble Marquess, when he responds in this debate, reassure us on this point and give us some hope of a relinquishment of taxation in future? Is this to go on in a sort of arithmetical progression, or what is to be the end of the growing discrepancy between the wealth of the country and the amount of taxation that is imposed on the people?

I have said enough, I think, to show the seriousness of these figures. But there is another reason why I think this particular Bill ought to be fully considered and discussed. For a period of over fifty years every Budget that has been introduced into this country has been, as far as possible, free from any imputation of protection. There are some people who suspect— I do not know whether rightly or wrongly—that the particular tax upon tobacco which has been the subject of considerable debate in the other House was not introduced so much for the purpose of balancing expenditure and revenue as for the purpose of introducing a new principle into the taxation of the country, and we cannot overlook the fact that it is imposed by the son of the head of the protectionist movement in this country.

Let me examine for a moment into the incidence of this tax on tobacco. Originally there was the same duty upon the importation of tobacco whether stripped or unstripped, viz., a duty of 3s. A duty was then imposed of 3s. 3d. upon stripped tobacco, so that the man who imported stripped tobacco had to pay 3d. more than the man who imported unstripped tobacco. Clearly, my Lords, the effect of that tax must be to restrict trade, and any taxation, the object of which is to restrict trade and not enhance it must, I submit, be of a protective character. It was imposed so that the man who stripped tobacco here should be protected against the importation of stripped tobacco from abroad. Therefore, my Lords, it amounted to a protective tax of 3d. per lb. on stripped tobacco. Of course, from that 3d. there must be deducted the cost of stripping tobacco in this country, which we are told is a trifling amount—about ½d. per lb.; therefore the remaining 2½d. is clearly in the nature of a protective tariff.

At first the Chancellor of the Exchequer denied with some heat that there was anything of a protective character in this tax; but the case which was made against its imposition by persons who had imported tobacco of the particular character in question into bond, and bought it, therefore, at a higher price, was so strong that the Chancellor of the Exchequer conceded by way of rebate a certain proportion, I think it was 1½d., on the existing stocks of stripped tobacco. That concession is a very significant one. because it amounts to practically an admission that, so far as it goes—and I admit it does not go very far—the tax is clearly of a protective character. Why, in spite of the strong opposition which it encountered in the House of Commons, this tax was maintained for the admittedly miserable results to the Budget which will now be found to accrue, is hard to conceive, unless there is some important reason at the back for the maintenance of this tax. It could not have been in order to balance revenue and expenditure, and therefore my conviction is that it was the protective character of this impost which tempted the Chancellor of the Exchequer to adhere to it in spite of all the arguments that were used against it. If that is so, it is a very significant fact; and it is quite right that those of us in this House who have always been free-traders should draw public attention to the nature of the year's Budget.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I am sure the House will not expect me to make a financial statement analogous to that which the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes in the House of Commons, but I think it due to your Lordships that I should follow in a few words what has been said by the noble and learned Lord who has just sat down. He has pointed to what I think we must all of us regard as a danger—I mean the great growth of our national expenditure; and he will forgive me for saying that he has made, with reference to that subject, the very kind of speech which I suggested a few minutes ago might be made at any time during the session by any noble Lord desiring to call the attention of this House to that most important subject. The noble and learned Lord, I understand, was alarmed to find that although the war had come to an end the large expenditure which followed upon the war had not terminated, but surely he must be aware that expenditure of that kind is not expenditure which you can suddenly shut off at a few weeks' notice. For example, there is one permanent item of increase growing out of the war expenditure. I refer to the interest on the large increase to the public indebtedness which was occasioned by the war itself—an addition, if I remember rightly, of something approaching £150,000,000.

As to the other items of increase, it is quite true that in the last ten years all the principal items of expenditure have risen rapidly; but there is a great deal to be said in explanation of the circumstances under which that increase has taken place. For example, I see that the expenditure on the charge of the public debt has increased during that period by £4,000,000, That is partlyinterest on the new war debt, and partly interest on those large public loans which have lately been contracted for military and naval purposes and also for various important public works. Then there is the increase in Army expenditure. That has risen in ten years by no less than £11,000,000. I agree with the noble and learned Lord that we should spare no effort to diminish that expenditure, and it is with this object that my right hon. colleague the Secretary of State forWar is endeavouring to discover some means of giving this country a cheaper but also not less efficient Army, and he has, I think, a right to appeal to both sides to assist him in bringing about that most desirable result.

The principal cause of increase of expenditure is, however, the Navy. The expenditure on the Navy has in ten years increased by very nearly £20,000,000, or by no less than 111 per cent. I admit that that is an augmentation which may well alarm us, but who is going to propose that the naval strength of this country should be reduced? It is interesting to turn for a moment to see what other nations are doing. I see that in the same period of time our naval expenditure has increased by 111 per cent. the naval expenditure of Germany has increased by no less than 140 per cent., that of Russia by 143 per cent. and that of the United States by 174 per cent. Well, my Lords, that at any rate is, I think, a *prima facie* explanation of the increase of the expenditure on the Navy. Take one other item—the increased expenditure upon education. That has risen in ten years by £5,500,000, but I am sure the noble and learned Lord would be the last person in the world to grudge the expenditure incurred on that most important subject.

The noble and learned Lord referred to the increase in the tea duties. It is much to be regretted that an article which is almost a necessary of life to our fellow-countrymen should be taxed, or that the tax should be increased, but we always endeavour to divide increased burdens as equitably as possible between direct and indirect taxation, and it seemed to us that a moderate increase on the tea duties was upon the whole a most reasonable way of obtaining additional revenue from indirect taxation. The only other item referred to was the tobacco tax. I will not follow the noble and learned Lord into the mysteries of the tobacco trade, but at any rate we are firmly of opinion that the tobacco duties are no more protective in their object and character than the old tobacco duties which, I believe, were imposed for the first time by Mr. Gladstone. I do not know that I can usefully detain your Lordships with further remarks on this subject, but I certainly do admit that the noble and learned Lord is justified in calling attention to the rate at which the national expenditure is progressing, and I can assure him that there is no matter which His Majesty's Government have more at heart than that expenditure should be kept within reasonable limits.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I am in rather a peculiar position to-night; I have not taken part in the division, and I will explain why. The noble Marquess, with his usual courtesy, sent to me two or three days ago to ask whether I would agree to this arrangement of having the debate at three o'clock, and the subsequent Commission the same afternoon. I rather hastily, perhaps, assented to the proposal, but I took care however, to explain to the noble Marquess last night that I was not responsible for more than my personal action. I support my noble friends, however, in dividing against the suspension of the Standing Orders. Now, as to speaking on this question, I had intended to have spoken earlier and to have gone into the whole subject with which this great Bill deals, but I was not able to because I had exhausted my right of speech in discussing the question of the suspension of the Standing Orders. I am rather diffident now about saying anything on the general subject, but I confess I feel so strongly on the point that I most gladly support the views which have been put forward by Lord Coleridge and other noble Lords as to the gigantic growth of the national expenditure. It is very serious indeed when we reflect that the expenditure of the country, though we are at peace, is increasing; and it is not only the expenditure of the country which is increasing, but the national credit which is decreasing.

No one more desires to see a strong Navy than I do, but the time has come when we must seriously consider the great yearly increase in the Naval Estimates. A great effort should be made to reduce them, or to prevent their increasing at the rate at which they have been increasing of late years. I believe I am right in saying that the naval expenditure of this country exceeds by £6,000,000 the naval expenditure of France, Germany, and Russia. These are very alarming figures, and I cannot help thinking that without really diminishing the effectiveness of the Navy some check on the growing expenditure might be made. I notice one remarkable fact in regard to the finance of the Governments of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour. They have proposed three taxes, all declared in turn to be simply revenue taxes, while each in its turn has been proved to be protective. I refer to the corn tax, the sugar tax, which was consequent on the Sugar Convention, and the tobacco tax. The last-named has already changed the current of trade in the tobacco business. For the past five years the average amount of stripped tobacco imported in the month of June has been 2,459 casks, but in June of this year, after the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was made known, it fell to 344 casks. I maintain that that, therefore, is a distinctly protective duty. While maintaining the importance of our having adequate time for the discussion of a Bill of this magnitude, I thank the noble Marquess for his statement with regard to the earlier date at which the similar Bill of next year will have to be passed; and I, for my part, am satisfied with making the urgent protest which I made last night and which I have repeated in the two speeches I have delivered this evening.

Earl BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, the exceedingly brief and, if I may say so, unsatisfactory nature of the reply made by the noble Marquess to the cogent remarks of my noble and learned friend Lord Coleridge make me anxious to press His Majesty's Government for some further reply to the Questions which have been addressed from this side of the House. The noble Marquess, I believe, would be one of the first to admit that there was little in the way of justification of or excuse for, the growing expenditure of the country in the remarks which he addressed to your Lordships. The enormous increase during the past ten years of no less than £48,000,000, a sum of money which, so far as we can see, and so far as we have received any assurance from the other side, shows no sign of decreasing in the future, is a matter which demands debate and consideration at your Lordships' hands.

There is one aspect of the matter which has not been touched upon in the course of the debate this afternoon to which I may be allowed to allude. Your Lordships will no doubt remember that when the first intimation of the tobacco duties became public some remarks were made by Members in another place with regard to the way in which the knowledge that this tax was going to be imposed by the Government seemed to have leaked out. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and, I think, in concert with him, the Prime Minister indignantly repelled any attack on their personal honour. No attack on their personal honour had been made by anybody, and it seemed to me exceedingly weak for any member of His Majesty's Government, when attacked for what was, at the worst, perhaps, only an indiscretion on the part of the Minister or of some clerk in his office, to take refuge in a plea of personal honour. I can assure your Lordships that for myself, having the pleasure to recognise in the Chancellor of the Exchequer a native of my own county, and having known him for many years, I feel it would be impertinent on anybody's part to make any kind of accusation against his personal honour. At the same time we say that it does seem, having regard to the imports of tobacco this year compared with last year, that some inquiry ought to take place into this matter. Your Lordships may need to be reminded of the fact that the imports of tobacco during March and April of this year were, I think, more than double the imports of similar goods during March and April of last year. If that is so, it surely is some reason why inquiry should be made into the matter, and it would, I think, be wise on the part of His Majesty's Government if they appointed some Departmental Committee to inquire into the matter and report to your Lordships.

With regard to the growing expenditure on the Army to which reference was made by the noble Marquess, I am sure I may say, on behalf of the large majority of people throughout the country, that they would not grudge the growing expenditure upon the Army if they were sure that the country was getting an adequate return, but they are forced at the present time to conclude, having regard especially to the speech which was made in another place last night by the present Secretary of State for India, that not even His Majesty's Government have complete faith and confidence in their own Army reorganisation scheme. In view of the exceedingly surprising attack which was made by the Secretary of State for India upon his colleague, we are, I contend, fully justified in asking His Majesty's Government for more information with regard to their scheme for the reorganisation of the Army.

The noble Marquess made reference to the expenditure upon the Navy in other countries. It is a familiar device of some noble Lords on the other side to use percentages, but percentages by themselves are not conclusive. I may remind your Lordships of certain percentage statistics with regard to teetotal soldiers. A Return was moved for and obtained with regard to the numbers of soldiers in a certain campaign who wore the blue ribbon and how they fared, and the Return came back that 50 per cent. had died of wounds and 50 per cent. of disease. That was an alarming Return, but a closer examination of the figures showed that there were only two soldiers to whom the Return referred at all, and, therefore, while only one soldier had died of wounds and one of disease the alarming Return was made to Parliament of 50 per cent. dying of wounds and 50 per cent. of disease. I say, therefore, that we are entitled to ask from the noble Marquess something more than mere percentages in this matter.

The figures the noble Marquess gave us were that the expenditure of this country upon the Navy had increased £20,000,000, I think, in the last ten years. But what we complain of is that the total expenditure of the country has gone up no less than £48,000,000, and we have in this way only £20,000,000 accounted for. Some ten years ago, although some doubt was expressed with regard to the preparedness of the Army by noble Lords on the other side and by their colleagues, no doubt that I know of was expressed with regard to the efficiency of the Navy; and if the Navy was efficient ten years ago, we need some explanation as to why it should have required another £20,000,000 to be spent upon it during the last ten years. The question of education is one on which I find myself in hearty agreement with the noble Marquess, who said that the £5,500,000 on education was an additional sum to which noble Lords on this side would not take exception. I only wish that we spent still more money upon education. We should not then hear so much of the ruin of British industries nor of the way in which our exports were declining in neutral markets.

Turning for a minute or two to the question of the tea duty, I should like to emphasise what was said by my noble and learned friend beside me with regard to the incidence of taxation in this matter. The increase in the income-tax and the increase in the tea duty as compared with one another do not, in the opinion of noble Lords on this side of the House, constitute a fair distribution of the burden. The proportion of the expenditure of the working classes which is spent upon tea makes them contribute to a far higher proportion than those who have to pay the extra penny on the income-tax. Therefore it is that we see in this addition to the tea duty one more sign of the desire of His Majesty's Government to favour certain sections of the community at the expense of the community as a whole.

Now, my Lords, let me turn to the question of South Africa, for, after all, we had expected to receive in the relief of the taxation of this country a large sum of money from South Africa. Noble Lords opposite have probably conveniently forgotten that only twelve months ago we were told that South Africa would be in a position to pay back large sums of money to this country before very long. The amount which was, I think, to be paid at the beginning of this year was £10,000,000. I do not think that we have received any sufficient or adequate explanation for the non-payment of that sum, and meanwhile the taxpayers of this country are obliged to go on paying the interest upon this £10,000,000 instead of this as a lump sum being added to the Sinking Fund.

The Sinking Fund, again, demands further consideration than was given to it by the noble Marquess. It is, after all, one of the best barometers of the prosperity of the country. If large sums of money are available year by year for the Sinking Fund then we may be sure that the country as a whole is in a prosperous condition. We regret that His Majesty's Government have not seen their way to do something more for that fund. The noble Marquess made mention of the public works which had been carried out during the past ten years. I should like to ask the noble Marquess, or some other representative of His Majesty's Government, a Question with regard to the fund out of which these public works are paid for. As I understand it—and if I am wrong some noble Lord opposite will, no doubt, be able to correct me—large numbers of these public works are paid for out of the moneys of the Post Office Savings Bank. If that is so, and imagining, without wishing for one moment that such a thing should happen, that the Post Office Savings Bank were obliged to realise their assets, the unhappy people who had deposited their money in the Post Office Savings Bank would find themselves presented with a quarter of a mile of the Uganda Railway or some equally useful article, because the deposits are used by His Majesty's Government in order to carry out various measures of public usefulness. I think that is an expenditure of the public money to which attention should be directed. I am not at all sure that it is in accordance with the soundest finance that such large sums of money should be spent in public works all over the world instead of being applied to the purchase of Consols in this country; if any noble Lord on the other side of the House believes that the finances of this country have prospered under His Majesty's present Government, I think the price at which Consols now stand in the market ought to disabuse his mind.

It was only a comparatively short time ago that the late Marquess of Salisbury mentioned Spain as being one of the decaying nations of Europe. It was a shorter time ago that we found that the public funds of this country had gone down below the public funds of that decaying nation. That seems to me to be a matter which demands the earnest attention of His Majesty's Government. There was another aspect of the matter referred to by the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition. I refer to the Sugar Convention, which, of course, arises under the Bill now before your Lordships' House. I could wish that a discussion on this measure and a defence of it had been undertaken by noble Lords opposite on some occasion when Viscount Goschen could have participated in the debate, for there are many people who regard the Sugar Convention, not only as being a measure of dangerous finance, but also as being a working model of protection. I think we are entitled to know in what way the Convention which was passed last year has benefited the people of this country. The price of sugar to the ordinary consumer has gone up, but it does not seem that the sugar producers of the West Indies have reaped any advantage from the enhanced price of sugar to the people of this country. We even find that less sugar from the West Indies has come into this country during the last few months than previously. Therefore we are entitled, I think, to ask His Majesty's Government whether, under such circumstances, they do not see their way to promise that in another year at least some remission shall be made in the sugar duties.

One of the most important reasons why noble Lords on this side look on this

Bill with hesitation is the doubt which we feel with regard to the financial views of His Majesty's Government. Time after time discussions have been initiated in this House, with the idea of eliciting from the noble Marquess some definite profession of faith with regard to the fiscal system of this country. In the absence of clearer and more definite statements we are obliged to draw our conclusions from the provisions of the Finance Bill for this year, and it is indeed difficult for some of us to reconcile the professions of noble Lords opposite with the taxation which is imposed on the country during the current year. We have the noble Marquess declaring that he is against any taxation of food, and yet we find an increase in the tea duties. We ask whether it would not have been possible to find some other source from which the necessary money might have been drawn. Although I am afraid it is no use expecting at such a late period anything more definite from the noble Marquess than we have had in the past, still I would urge him, if he can see his way to do so, to say something more definite with regard to the taxation of the food of the people than we have yet been able to extract from him.

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, I did not happen to be in the House when the noble Marquess the Leader of the House was speaking, but I understand that he alluded to the question of the growth of the military services of the Crown. Well, my Lords, that seems to me to be a matter which really does demand the most serious consideration. The military services of the Crown ten years ago cost £35,500,000, and now they have reached the appalling figure, which has to be provided out of revenue alone, of over £66,000,000. My noble friend Lord Beauchamp referred to the remarks made by the noble Marquess opposite in regard to education. We entirely endorse the views he expressed, and heartily rejoice at any wide expenditure on education. But I would remind your Lordships that while the total expenditure on the Army amounts now to the enormous sum of over £66,000,000, the sum which we spend upon education does not amount to £15,000,000.

Reference has been made to the state of the National Debt. The National Debt has been increased through the policy of the Government in South Africa by over £159,000,000, and not one penny of that Debt is covered by the Bill now before your Lordships. On the other hand, we still have what is a most serious and cruel imposition upon the middle classes—a war income-tax in times of peace. As my noble friend has said, we have also to face the fact that Consols, which represent the credit of the country, have fallen in a greater ratio than the leading securities of any other nation. I look upon that as a very serious matter, because Consols represent the credit of the country. They represent the rate at which the country can borrow, and our great strength in regard to the war in South Africa was not so much our military preparedness as the credit of this country which, owing to careful and prudent administration of its finances, stood so high.

I wish to call attention to the statement made by the noble Lord and others to the effect that this Budget contains the germs of protection. There can be no denying that that is the case. You cannot have a more clear and visible proof of this than the portion of the Budget which deals with the duty upon cigarettes. There is no Excise duty placed upon cigarettes; it is an import duty only. Now, what is the position of affairs as regards cigarettes? A new duty of 1s. per lb. has been imposed upon all foreign cigarettes. This brings in as additional revenue the paltry sum of £20,000 a year. But who pays 90 per cent of this duty? Ninety per cent. of this duty is paid by the consumer. That is a distinct, a clear, and a definite protective duty, and it is a most remarkable illustration of what protection means. It only brings into the country a revenue of £20,000 a year, which is hardly worth considering, but the consumer is taxed 90 per cent of the duty. It has also raised the price of home-made cigarettes. These, you may say, are not in themselves large matters, but they are interesting now when the whole question of protection and free trade is being considered We feel on this side of the House that it is most important that every opportunity should be taken to show that this Budget introduces a totally new system of taxation.

My noble friend Lord Beauchamp referred to the £30,000,000 promised to be paid to this country as the contribution from the Transvaal. Lord Milner told us that the finances of the Transvaal were in such a condition that the taxpayers of this country must abandon their claim for this £30,000,000, but more recently I read a report of a speech by Lord Milner, in which he alluded with cynical contempt to the crocodile tears that had been shed over the condition of affairs in the Transvaal. He went on to say that affairs in that Colony were not half so bad as they were represented to be. If that is so, I should like to ask, when is this £30,000,000 to be repaid to the taxpayers of this country?

I do not think it is possible to exaggerate the anxiety which exists throughout the country respecting its finances. We have had figures as to the enormous increase in Army expenditure—yet I venture to say there is no one in your Lordships' House, not even the noble Marquess who leads it, who dares avow what the proposals of the Government are with regard to the Army. In addition, it must be remembered that we have an automatic increase in the Navy Estimates. It may be said that your Lordships have no right to interfere with the details of Finance Bills. Your Lordships are some of the largest taxpayers in the country, and it really is monstrous to say that we have no right to consider this question of taxation. Any unwise and wasteful expenditure of money chiefly falls upon the owners of real and personal property; and there is a very strong feeling that while we have on the one hand this growing and enormous expenditure, we have not received from the Government any definite basis or system for confronting or dealing with it. This is merely a makeshift Budget. We have no proposals treating seriously the very grave increase in the National Debt, or the growing expenditure of the country. I do not know whether noble Lords will wish to divide the House on this Bill, but it seems to me a grave question whether some of us on this side ought not to enter our protest, not only as to the conditions under which we are asked to consider this Bill, but as to the Bill itself, considering its totally novel and mischievous principles.

On Question,

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 42; Not-Contents, 8.

CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Argyll, D.
Devonshire, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.

Ancaster, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E.
Cromer, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)

Feversham, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Northesk, E.
Selborne, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Sidmouth, V.

Armstrong, L.
Balfour, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.
Glenesk, L.

Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
James, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Errol.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L. [*Teller.*]
Lovat, L.
Methuen, L.
Newton, L.
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Raglan, L.
Robertson, L.
Sherborne, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Beauchamp, E. [*Teller.*]
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.

Portsmouth, E.

Coleridge, L. [*Teller*].

Emly, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)

Bill read 2^{a} accordingly.

Moved, "That the Bill be committed."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: We have been told that a change has been made, and that 1st July has been substituted for 1st August next year. I would ask the noble Marquess to explain at what part of the Bill and in what clause 1st July is substituted for 1st August.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: As I understand, it is intended to substitute 1st July for 1st August as the date up to which taxes may be continued.

EARL CARRINGTON: I should like to ask the noble Marquess how this will affect the income-tax. There is no mention, so far as I can make out, of any change such as that proposed, in Clause 7, Part 2, of the Bill.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: In the Act of 1903 the wording is that the taxes shall continue to be imposed, levied, and paid till the 1st day of August. It is the presence of these words which, in our opinion, obliges us to finish these proceedings before 1st August. In the Bill now before your Lordships the provision is that the taxes shall be continued, levied, and paid till the 1st day of July. It is quite clear that the words "1st of July" will give us more elbow room.

EARL CARRINGTON: There are no such words in Part 2 with reference to income-tax. I ask, Does this apply to the income-tax?

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): I am sure it will be a source of satisfaction to the noble Earl to know that it does not apply to income-tax. In regard to income-tax the date remains the 6th of April; it always has been so.

*LORD COLERIDGE: As I have never seen the Bill, I desire to ask the noble Marquess a Question. As I understand, there has this year been appropriated £1,000,000 from the unclaimed dividends account. Now that money clearly does not belong to the Government. It is unclaimed money belonging to some persons unknown. I understand that the majority of it is now to be devoted to current expenditure. I may, of course, be speaking inaccurately, but the noble Marquess has given me no opportunity of studying the Bill in all its details. Not having seen the Bill, I ask whether it contains any authority to the Government to take this £1,000,000, which is the property of some persons unknown, or, at any rate, not the property of the Government, and whether there is any authority in the Bill to devote that money to current expenditure? I presume that that would want the authority of Parliament just as much as the levying of the tobacco tax, the tea duty, or any of the other taxes.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of SALISBURY): It is perfectly true that £1,000,000 is taken for current purposes, but I can assure the noble and learned Lord that we do not intend to defraud anybody. A charge for that sum will be maintained on the Consolidated Fund under a separate Act of Parliament which has already been passed.

On Question, Motion negatived.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3a."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

*EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, I ask your Lordships whether the silence on the other side of the House tends to the dignity of this Assembly. The occasion is one which demands something more in the way of reply than we have yet received from the Government. We have attempted to put before your Lordships the serious condition of the country's finances. At the most the noble Marquess has occupied ten or fifteen minutes in his justification of the increased taxation. I cannot imagine that in regard to an important matter of this kind His Majesty's Government can think they have given enough time for its consideration. Here is the House of Lords asked to consider a Bill which has not even been circulated. Although I know well enough the constitutional position of this House with regard to the Money Bill, still I cannot think it is in accordance with the dignity of your Lordships' House that we should be asked to read a Bill and pass it through all its stages when it has not even been printed and circulated. If the noble Marquess will not answer the Questions which have been addressed to him, perhaps he will be good enough to explain from what source is drawn the money for the expenditure on the Uganda Railway of £67,000, on the Land Registry Buildings of £16,000, on the New General Buildings of £162,000, and also the expenditure on the Public Offices in Dublin. There are other items upon which I should like information, but I have no wish to waste the time of your Lordships. I would ask the noble Marquess to explain from what sums the amounts I have quoted are to be spent.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The points which the noble Earl has raised are no doubt very interesting ones, but they relate to questions of detail. If the noble Earl will ask me the Question on any other evening I shall be glad to provide him with an Answer.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Perhaps the noble Marquess will be good enough, if not on the present occasion at any rate in the near future, to tell us whether we may hope for some definite promise as to the payment of the £30,000,000 which the Government have undertaken shall be paid over to us by the Transvaal.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I rise on a point of order. I should like to ask whether the date on which this money may or may not be paid has any bearing on the question of the Third Reading of the Finance Bill.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: The noble Earl seems to have constituted himself a sort of master of the ceremonies of your Lordships' House. He is a very mournful one on this occasion for he rose with a most mournful countenance. My question is quite pertinent because the finances of the country are necessarily dependent upon the contributions which are promised. A contribution of £30,000,000 from the Transvaal is certainly not a negligible asset in considering the question of the debt of the country; and it is a question which, if we cannot discuss it now, we can never discuss. When we are dealing with the finances of the country we should know what the assets are. I demur to the suggestion that the question of the contribution of £30,000,000 from the Transvaal cannot appropriately be discussed on the Finance Bill.

*LORD COLERIDGE: My Lords, I am the last person to wish to obstruct the business, but I would appeal to the noble Marquess for a reply to the pertinent Questions raised by my noble friend Lord Beauchamp. Many questions of detail involve most important principles; and the fact that they are details does not exonerate the noble Marquess from the obligation cast upon him by his position as Leader of the House of answering Questions pertinent to the Bill before us. My noble friend has pointed out that there are certain items of expenditure amounting in all to the sum of £7,305,000. Naval works are accountable for £3,318,000; Military works for £2,950,000; telephones for £780,000; the Uganda Railway for £67,000; the Land Registry Buildings for £16,000; the New General Buildings for £162,000, and the Public Offices in Dublin for £12,000, the total being £7,305,000—which, if a detail, is a very considerable detail. My noble friend has asked the Leader of the House whether or not that sum of money is forthcoming from the Savings Bank deposits—a most material question; and I should have thought the duty would have been cast on the noble Marquess of answering it now. He says he will answer it on some future occasion if the Question is put to him. Surely that is not the way in which the noble Earl should be treated. I entirely associate myself with the Questions put by the noble Earl, and I respectfully ask the noble Marquess for a reply.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I understand that the whole of these items of expenditure have been authorised by various Acts of Parliament. I make no apology for not being able to reply offhand to these Questions. I cannot give the information now, but if the noble Lord will ask me for it on Monday, I shall probably be able to give it.

EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, I submit with great respect that when Questions are asked by noble Lords in this

House as to the expenditure of millions of public money, it is scarcely courteous to them to put them off and say an Answer shall be given on Monday, after the Bill has become law. This is one of the most important Bills that can come before this House. We are a commercial nation; our commerce and trade are everything, and we are naturally anxious to know how these millions are being spent. Millions of public money are at stake, and are being voted as if they were twenty-five shillings or half-a-crown. This is a proper protest to make, and I ask the noble Marquess whether he cannot answer the very pertinent Questions asked by my noble friend.

On Question, Bill read 3ª, and passed.

LICENSING BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday next.—(*The Lord Belper.*) (No. 171.)

THE MILITIA FORCE.

*The **EARL OF WEMYSS** rose to move to resolve—"That, in the opinion of this House, any scheme of Army reorganisation that does away with the Militia force is contrary to sound policy, destroying as it does the ancient constitutional foundation of our existing military system." He said: My Lords, as I believe this will be the only opportunity which will present itself of calling attention to the very important matter to which this Resolution refers, perhaps your Lordships will allow me to do so even at this late hour. The Militia, so far as we are able to judge from what has passed in your Lordships' House, is about to be abolished. That was the view of the position taken by my noble friend Lord Burghclere in his speech on the Army reorganisation scheme. The same view was taken of it by Lord Spencer; and I got from Lord Donoughmore, the able exponent in your Lordships' House of the views of the War Office, a clear and distinct affirmation of the fact that it is intended to absorb the whole of the Militia force. When the noble Earl the Under-Secretary was speaking, I asked him distinctly whether the intention was to absorb the whole of the Militia. He replied "Yes;" and my noble friend Lord Burghclere seemed so pleased at getting that admission that he kissed his hand to me in thankfulness.

My Lords, this is a very important question and had time permitted I should have gone more fully into it than I feel justified in doing to-night. I should have referred to the history of the Militia, and have endeavoured to show that it is the foundation of our military system, embodying as it does the right of the Crown compulsorily to force men to serve for home defence. But I shall not go into that further than to say this, that the present Act dates from the year 1852, when Lord John Russell brought into the House of Commons a Local Militia Bill. Lord Palmerston took exception to the Militia being localised, and moved to strike out the word "local," and in doing so he struck out the Government as well, for the Government thereupon resigned. The first act of the succeeding Government was the bringing in by Mr. Walpole of the Bill that became the present Act.

I should like to call attention to the great services rendered by the Militia to the country at various times. In 1803, 15,000 Militia Volunteers joined the Army; in 1808, the Local Militia was, in addition, established; 20,000 Militiamen volunteered then for the Army for twelve months. In 1812, three strong battalions joined the Army. During the ten years from 1803 to 1813, 100,000 Militiamen passed into the Regular Army. In 1815, Militiamen in great numbers joined the Army and served at Waterloo. In 1854 we had the Crimean War, during which fifty battalions of Militia volunteered for service; ten were sent to the Mediterranean as garrison, thus freeing the Regular troops for service in the Crimea. In all, the Militia sent to the war in South Africa, 1,691 officers and 43,875 men, and we know that every year the Militia gives 14,000 recruits to the Army. Besides that, up till a quite recent date there was the Militia Army Reserve. In this Reserve there were 30,000 men up to last year, when the Reserve was abolished by the late Secretary of State for War. That abolition means this, that if you were engaged in war to-morrow you would have 30,000 men less to count upon to fill the ranks of the Army than you had when you entered into the South African War.

I now come to the avowed intention to absorb the Militia force into the Regular Army. I have never heard of such a proposal until it was made by the present Secretary of State for War. Against the view of the right hon. Gentleman I could quote the views of many high authorities, but I will content myself with opinions expressed by Mr. Pitt a hundred years ago, by Lord Palmerston in the fifties, and, finally, by the Duke of Wellington. What did the Duke of Wellington say in his last speech in your Lordships' House with reference to the Militia? He said—

"I recommend you to adopt this measure (Mr. Walpole's Bill). It will give you a constitutional force. It will not be at first or for some time forward what we could desire, but it will become what we want—an efficient auxiliary to the Regular Army."

I am quite content, in defence of the Militia and its continued existence, to cite these authorities. What have we to weigh against them? Nothing, so far as I know, except the authority of the present War Minister. I feel sure that weighed against these in the balance of public opinion Mr. Arnold-Forster's reasons would kick the beam. It is in these circumstances that I venture to ask your Lordships to pass the Resolution which stands in my name.

My Lords, I have received numerous letters approving of this Motion from persons whose opinions cannot fail to have great weight in your Lordships' House. The noble and gallant Lord the ex-Commander-in-Chief, Lord Roberts, writes that he is very sorry he cannot be present, as he has to be at Lancaster to-day. But your Lordships heard the noble and gallant Lord quite recently, and it was evident that his speech was directed strongly against any haste in dealing with this question. He prayed your Lordships to be cautious in dealing with this important force. I have also in my hand a letter from the Duke of Somerset, who regrets that he cannot be present, and says—

"Instead of destroying the Militia, which is evidently the intention of the Government, the country should see that every effort is made to increase it in numbers and in efficiency."

Lord Penrhyn writes me a short and pithy letter, in which he expresses regret that he will not be able to record his vote in favour of my Motion against the destruction of the Militia. He adds—

"I have been brought up to believe that the Militia is the backbone of the Army, and I am still of that opinion."

Lord Wolseley also writes regretting that he cannot be here to-day, but condemning in the strongest possible terms what is proposed to be done by His Majesty's Government in regard to the Militia force. Lastly, I have in my hand a letter from Sir Alfred Turner, who was at the head of the Auxiliary Forces at the War Office. He writes—

"Dear Lord Wemyss,—We ought all to be grateful to you for taking up the defence of Great Britain's old constitutional force against Mr. Arnold-Forster, who clearly means to abolish it if he can, in spite of the really splendid services it did during the war, when, in addition to the numbers who went abroad, the whole of the remainder were embodied for very long periods. If the numbers of the Militia have fallen away, and if its efficiency is not what it should be, the reason is the utter stupidity with which it has been treated by the War Office. It has been sent year after year to unpopular camps and away from its counties, which has been the chief cause of its falling away."

The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition spoke the other day in the highest possible terms of the importance of the Militia, and he added—

"It is the force which, during the late war, furnished such an enormous number of men to the Army in South Africa. The country would be much staggered if it thought this force was to be shortly destroyed."

I think these quotations clearly point to the importance of this force, and to the desirability, instead of destroying it, of making it as efficient as we can.

I know not what course the Government will take with reference to my Motion, nor what course your Lordships will take. So far as the Government are concerned, they do not seem to be quite at one on this subject. We had, on the one hand, an able exposition from the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War, but, on the other hand, we had a speech from the Leader of the Government in this House, Lord Lansdowne; and I cannot believe that the noble Marquess in his heart desires to do away with a force on which he said he relied, even by compulsory service, in case of emergency. The noble Marquess said—

> "Let me say frankly that the Paper which your Lordships have before you does not represent what can be described as the final conclusion of His Majesty's Government."

This Paper is Mr. Arnold-Forster's Memorandum, and the Leader of the Government in this House says that it does not represent what can be described as the final conclusion of His Majesty's Government on many of the subjects to which it has reference, and one of the most important subjects with which it deals is, as your Lordships know, the Militia. I do not know whether His Majesty's Government are going to resist this Motion, which is simply a statement of fact. It is, after all, only a truism. But, if the Government do resist it, I ask your Lordships to take an independent and patriotic line. If your Lordships often did that on questions of principle that come before you, you could govern England, and save our country from many a measure which we would be much better without.

There are two courses open to your Lordships — one is to stand by the old Militia force, which is the foundation and the basis of our military system; the other is to substitute for it, assuming that the Militia is to be done away with, this territorial mongrel begotten by the present Minister of War. I feel, however, that Mr. Arnold-Forster's scheme will only add some fragments to the War Office administrative wreckage that floats and eddies round the base of Lord Herbert's statue in Pall Mall, and on which, with bowed head and sorrowful mien he continuously looks down, and I am bound to say from my experience of the War Office that it is practically the Goodwin Sands of political Army administration. I say "political" because, unfortunately, one always sees that in these matters politics enter largely, and the safety of the politician is on the whole placed before the safety of the nation. Be that as it may, I ask your Lordships to affirm a Resolution which in your heart of hearts I am sure everyone of you must feel to be right. And certain I am that if the Opposition were to propose the abolition of the Militia force, the foundation of our military system, such a proposal would be rejected by your Lordships by a very large majority. I beg to move the Motion standing in my name.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, any scheme of Army reorganisation that does away with the Militia force is contrary to sound policy, destroying as it does the ancient constitutional foundation of our existing military system."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I rise early in this discussion, because I am anxious to draw attention to a particular part of the subject, on which up to the present there has been absolute and complete silence, in the hope that the noble Earl the Under-Secretary will be able to give us some information upon it. But before I come to that, I wish to say that I entirely adhere to the remarks I made the other day about the Militia, and which the noble Earl near me has quoted. I certainly understood from the noble Earl the Under-Secretary that the Government were in favour of a homogeneous plan, and of welding, as he called it, the Militia into the territorial forces.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): I used the word "we." I meant the Army Council, and not the Government.

EARL SPENCER: Then I ask the noble Earl, Is the Army Council to be considered as a separate and independent body? I should be much surprised to hear that the Board of Admiralty was independent of the Cabinet, and that its particular views on a question of policy might be distinguished from those of the Government. I have a right to complain of the noble Earl putting upon the Army Council the desire to absorb the Militia into the territorial system. But what I rise particularly to call attention to is this. In former years I had considerable experience of the very large body of men constituting the Irish Militia. In my first Viceroyalty, I found that the Militia had not been called out for exercise for a considerable number of years on account of the Fenian troubles. I rather think that at that time the transfer of the Militia from the Lord-Lieutenant to the War Office had not taken place. At all events, I had a great deal to do with the Irish Militia, and I recommended, and the

Cabinet agreed, that they should be called out for exercise.

A NOBLE LORD: It was Lord Cardwell who made the transfer.

*EARL SPENCER: I do not remember whether or not the transfer had taken place at that time, but I think they were under the Lord-Lieutenant, and this was just previous to Mr. Cardwell's transfer of their control to the War Office. I may be wrong, but that is immaterial. The Militia were called out, and I had the opportunity of seeing nearly every Militia regiment in Ireland. I took great interest in them, and was struck with the fact that they were a particularly fine body of men. Moreover, they had more officers than the English Militia. In Ulster there were a great many regiments which drew numbers of men from Scotland. These men, who belonged to Ulster, were at work in factories and other places in Scotland, and they invariably came over during their holidays to do their training. That showed, I thought, a spirit which ought to be commended. I am ready to admit that a considerable change may have taken place in regard to the Irish Militia since then, but I am rather inclined from what I have heard to believe that very much the same state of things exists now as existed then. Ireland is in a totally different position with regard to the Auxiliary Forces from either England or Scotland, for there are no Volunteers in Ireland. The only defensive force is the Militia. Therefore, I think it is very important that this point should be considered—namely, what do the Government propose to do with regard to the Irish Militia? I admit that the Militia force is not now in a satisfactory state, but I am strongly opposed to the idea of destroying it. I am much inclined, therefore, to support my noble friend's Motion, but I must not be supposed to endorse all his views on the Militia, especially on the subject of the Militia ballot, of which he is such a persistent advocate.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I have said nothing about that to-night.

*EARL SPENCER: No, but the noble Earl's name is so bound up with that subject that I wish it to be clearly understood that, in supporting my noble friend's Motion now before the House, I do not endorse his views on the subject of the Militia ballot. I rose chiefly, however, for the purpose of calling attention to the case of the Irish Militia, because that is a point on which we have not heard a single word, and I think it is an important element in the consideration of this question.

*LORD HARRIS: My Lords, I am not prepared to say at this moment whether I can support the Motion of the noble Earl opposite or not. It depends rather upon what the Government have to say to-night or at some future time on the subject. At present it seems to me we are very much in the dark as to what are the intentions of the Government with regard to the Militia. At present their proposals are entirely inchoate. We have not heard any explanation either from the Secretary of State for War or from the noble Earl the Under-Secretary which would lead us to be certain what is the system which it is proposed to introduce in substitution for the present one so far as the Militia is concerned.

Some years ago when I had the honour to serve at the War Office I took a great deal of interest in the Militia, and was chairman of a Committee which took a great deal of evidence upon it; and one conclusion I came to from the evidence we had before us, and it has remained fixed in my mind ever since, was that the Army has got no more useful recruiting agent than the Militia. And for this reason. There are many lads in the country who are bitten with the idea of military service but rather dread tying themselves down for what was in those days eight years with the colours and four years with the Reserve, and the Militia gave them the opportunity of seeing what military service was like. I believe that large numbers of young men went into the Militia with that object in view. I think it must be most discouraging for Militia officers to see lads come into their corps and get trained, and then for the best of them to pass into the Army. I sympathise very much with Militia officers in regard to that, but at the same time I recognise that the Militia is the most successful recruiting agent the Army has had for some considerable time. Therefore, I do trust

His Majesty's Government will consider very gravely from that point of view the policy of so changing the Militia service or so reducing its strength as to endanger its recruiting power. The Government may say that the new period of service which they propose to introduce is so short that it will serve in place of the Militia to enable a lad to make up his mind whether or not he cares for military service. I am a little doubtful about that. It seems to me that two years is too long a time, and that the lad will think he has had enough military service after that time, and will not be inclined to join the general-service Army for the nine years. Therefore, I do hope the Government will, before they present their scheme to the country, seriously consider this point.

I understand from the Secretary of State that he is going to consult the Militia colonels during the autumn. I assume, therefore, that the Government scheme, whatever it is, is not complete. I do trust that before they present their complete scheme to the country they will bear in mind the great advantage it is to give these young fellows the opportunity of putting in a few months service to see how they like it. It is suggested in the Secretary of State's speech that there is a portion of the Militia which is redundant, which cannot be fitted into any scheme for the defence of these shores. I should be quite prepared to support the Government, if they think it necessary, in lopping off unnecessary limbs. The illustrious Duke the late Duke of Cambridge said to me once, after a War Office meeting in which he had struggled long against a reduction of numbers—

> "I made the best fight I could, but, of course, if there is not money enough, the numbers must be cut down."

He added—

> "I have often submitted to a reduction of numbers, but I have never submitted to a reduction of *cadres*."

His late Royal Highness thought this most important, because while you have the *cadres* you can fill them up in case of emergency. That is an important point which ought not to be lost sight of, and it was that which was done in the case of the Yeomanry regiments sent to South Africa.

The other night I asked the noble Earl the Under-Secretary what length of time he considered the general-service regiments would have to put in abroad, and he replied that he was hopeful that they would not have to serve as long abroad as they do now; but I cannot see how he worked that out on the figures he subsequently gave us. As I understand, there are to be about 105 general-service regiments. There are now, I think, seventy-nine on foreign service. Our recent experience shows that the demands of the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office go on increasing. The result is a greater demand on the English Army abroad, and I think it most unwise if the War Office authorities are calculating on a considerable reduction of numbers for foreign service. There are at present seventy-nine regiments on foreign service, and there is a proposal to reduce the number of battalions in the general-service regiments to 105. I work out the figures in this way, that regiments will have to put in something like twenty-two or twenty-three years on foreign service out of a tour of service of thirty years, the tour at present being eighteen years abroad and twelve years at home. The Secretary of State for War expressed great interest in the territorialisation system and in the history of regiments. Now, I ask what connection can possibly be maintained between a county battalion and its county when that battalion is to be abroad for three-fourths of its tour of service, and is to put in three years of the remaining period at Aldershot? The connection between the county and the regiment, will, I fear, be very much diminished. I deplore that as much as anything in the many intricacies of the scheme that has been presented to us. I think that the interest of a county in its regiment, an interest which has grown up by degrees, but which was enormously increased and intensified by the war, is a most valuable element in arousing enthusiasm for military service; and, therefore, I do hope that the Government and the Secretary of State for War will consider the matter very carefully before they finally decide upon so reducing the number of battalions as to necessitate such a long tour of foreign service as that to which I have referred.

The speech of the noble Marquess the Leader of the House, the other night, filled me with the greatest apprehension. I could not detect one note of enthusiasm for this scheme. If that is so, and if I have correctly construed the noble Marquess's attitude, I ask the Government: Is it fair on their supporters in this House and in the other House to present the scheme to us and lead us to suppose that it is a scheme in which the Government believe the safety of the country rests? I do not think I am exaggerating the case when I say that the noble Marquess either damned the scheme with faint praise, or praised it with faint condemnation. I hesitate to support my noble friend's Motion to-night because I believe the Government must have something more positive to say with regard to a scheme upon which the safety of these shores as well as the Empire at large rests.

Lord RAGLAN: My Lords, like my noble friend who has just sat down and the other noble Lords who have addressed the House to-night, I am bound to say I have the same doubt as to what the scheme of His Majesty's Government really is. I have endeavoured to find out what it is. I asked my noble friend the Leader of the House certain definite Questions, and he said to me, "Wait till the debate on Friday next, and in the meantime carefully study the Memorandum of the Secretary of State for War." My Lords, I have very carefully studied that Memorandum, and I can assure your Lordships I am no further advanced than I was before. I should have put this down, perhaps, to my want of intelligence, but I find that every other person to whom I have spoken is in the same nebulous state of mind as to what the Government proposals really are. Then I come to what has been said in the course of the military debates that have taken place in your Lordships' House. First of all there was the statement of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary in which he said positively that the entire Militia were to be abolished or welded into a territorial Army, which is an expression I do not understand myself, and I very much doubt if His Majesty's Government understand it. Then the noble Marquess the Leader of the House said he did not think it was going to be done like that; at any rate, commanding officers of Militia were going to be consulted in the autumn. If it has been decided that the Militia are to be abolished, what are commanding officers to be consulted upon in the autumn?

With regard to the position of the Militia, I think noble Lords on the Front Bench will bear me out when I say that I have been a most persistent advocate for the improvement of the Militia for many years. I do not think anyone has clamoured more for reform and efficiency than I have, and I have endeavoured to make myself thoroughly acquainted with the condition of that force. No doubt it will be said that if the Militia is in a bad condition, why object to its abolition? Well, my Lords, I have long believed that the Militia could, by the exercise of a very small amount of what I might call "sympathetic administration," and the expenditure of a certain amount of money, be put into such a position as to be able to be brought thoroughly up to date and to carry out the duties for which hitherto it has perhaps been incompetent. The want of men I put down to the loss of the agricultural population, and I do not believe it is possible to make any very large additions to the numbers in the Militia by anything short of some system of universal service. But I do think this, that you could perfectly well maintain a Militia force of something like the normal establishment at a small expenditure of money and by sympathetic administration.

As to officers, that I am sure is entirely a question of money. There is not a large leisured class in this country prepared to take commissions, but if the War Office would pay a certain retaining fee they would get a fair number of officers. Of course the larger the fee the more officers they would get. I believe that if they gave, say, £100 a year to every Militia officer, they would get a large addition in the number of officers. The position of commanding officers is an extremely difficult one. The commanding officer is of no account at all during the non-training period. If he were given a free hand a different state of things would obtain. For a short time there existed a most excellent body called the Militia Advisory Board. They may not have possessed any very great weight with the authorities at the War Office, but that Board was a channel through which we were able to make our wants known to the Secretary of State for War. That is the great difficulty I have always felt as a commanding officer —the difficulty of making our wants known to the Secretary of State for War. I do not know why the Advisory Board was abolished. It was not extravagant, and I think it did a very great deal of good. It certainly gave the force a greater amount of confidence than it had hitherto possessed in the War Office administration.

Your Lordships may ask, If the Militia is unsatisfactory, why not abolish it? I reply, Because I believe it can, at a very small cost, be made most efficient. The chief point about the Militia, to my mind, is its remarkable cheapness. Even at an additional cost it would be by far the cheapest force serving the Crown. I will put into pounds, shillings, and pence, the cost of the Auxiliary Forces that went to South Africa. Before the war the cost of a Militiaman was £14 a year, the cost of a Yeoman £10 a year, and the cost of a Volunteer £4. I am speaking, of course, in round figures. Something more than half the Militia served in the War—some 43,000 rank and file, as units, and some 14,000 as Militia Reserves. That works out that every Militiaman who served in the South African War cost the country £28. I turn to the Volunteers, and I find that only about 20,000, all told, served in the war. That is somewhere about 8 per cent, of the strength. Therefore every Volunteer who went to South Africa had cost the country £50 a year for a considerable time. About 20 per cent. of the Yeomanry went to South Africa, and there, again, the cost of each Yeoman was £50 a year. That was not the only direction in which the Militia proved a cheap force, because the remaining 50 per cent. of the Militia were all embodied in this country. Therefore the Militia showed that they were not only a cheap force, but a force that the country could rely upon.

The noble Earl the mover of the Motion now before the House spoke of the services of the Militia in the past. The Militia have been tried over and over again and found to be absolutely reliable, and their reward is that they are to be abolished. What is to be substituted for this force? We are told that we are to have a new sort of territorial Army. We have had absolutely no figures, no information of any sort as to what this territorial Army is to be, or what it is to cost. We have had nothing but the barest possible generalities. I am informed that it will cost considerably over £10,000,000 to build barracks for this force. So far as I am able to judge, it will mean in any case a large reduction in numbers and an entirely new force which cannot be very much more highly trained than the Militia are now. It is to be enlisted for two years. It is true that they have two years service in Germany, but is the War Office prepared to give their recruits the same training as recruits are given in Germany? If so, I can tell the War Office that they will not have many recruits to train. More than that, it is to consist of small battalions of 500 rank and file, of whom 100 are to be long-service and 400 short-service men. Out of those 400 men, I am prepared to prophesy that at least 250 will be recruits of under one year's service. Wastage you must have, and nothing short of increasing the pay of the Army to a gigantic figure would give you anything but a large mass of recruits about the age of eighteen.

It is imagined that the same class of men who have joined the Militia will go into this territorial Army. My noble friend Lord Harris has expressed doubts on that point. There is another class of men, and a very valuable class, which I regret has disappeared largely from the Militia, but which does still exist in certain corps. I refer to the old civilian Militiamen, the men who never were soldiers, but who went into the Militia because they liked a certain amount of soldiering, and became a most valuable element in the regiment. I do not believe for one moment that that class of man will enlist any more for two years than he is at present prepared to enlist for three years. Therefore you will wipe out that class of man altogether unless he goes into the Volunteers. But in Ireland, as the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, there are no Volunteers, and, therefore, if the Irish Militia is abolished, those men will be lost altogether to the Crown. As to officers, as far as I gather, all the senior officers, myself included, I presume, are to be abolished, and no Militia officer is to exist any longer above the rank of captain.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Major.

LORD RAGLAN: That will deprive the country of the services of a great number of gentlemen whose services are exceedingly valuable. I refer to those old soldiers who, having served a certain amount of time in the Army, have transferred their services to the Militia. You will completely wipe out from the forces of the Crown that class of officer, and I am also firmly convinced that you will wipe out a great number of other officers who will refuse to go into Militia regiments where they never can be regarded as fit to rise to a position of command. In any case, as far as I can make out, there must be a very large reduction in the number of officers. To each of these proposed new battalions are to be added ten officers who are to do a month or six weeks training every year. I very much doubt whether a very desirable class of officer will join when there is no possibility of rising above the rank of major, and the class of men who now officer your Militia regiments will disappear altogether.

This is a matter on which I feel most strongly. I have the honour to command a Militia regiment, and, perhaps I may be allowed to say, not one of the worst regiments in the service. I have at this time thirty-one out of my thirty-six officers, and 960 out of my 1,000 men. I should have had more than my thousand men had not my recruiting been interfered with. I and my family have served in that regiment for 240 years; it has been commanded by a member of my family for more than one hundred years. But, putting sentiment on one side, I should be willing that that regiment should be swept away if it was incapable of being brought up to date, or if something better was going to be substituted for it. I do not, however, believe that those conditions exist.

This remarkable proposition has been sprung upon us very suddenly at the end of a long session. The remarkable thing about it is that it is quite at variance with the earlier speeches which were made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. One of the very early speeches he made after taking office was at Liverpool, in the course of which he particularly alluded to the Militia as a force which wanted assistance and sympathetic management, and a force which should be looked after. His way of doing that is like curing toothache by cutting off a person's head. I trust that His Majesty's Government will defer these drastic changes, at all events, until those of us who sit on this side of the House and usually support His Majesty's Government have had a chance of hearing what their actual suggestions really are. The Militia has never failed the country in a time of need, and I ask the Government to think twice and even thrice before they attempt to tamper with it.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I have been asked a number of Questions this evening extending very widely over many parts of the scheme which has been outlined by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State in another place, and I do not know that I should be in order in referring to all of them, more especially to those which were raised by my noble friend Lord Harris. He asked two Questions in particular, both with reference to the foreign-service Army. I am sorry that in the few sentences in which I attempted to reply to him on the last occasion on which your Lordships discussed this subject I did not make the matter clear, but if, at any time in the near future the noble Lord will give me five minutes I can explain the matter fully and, I hope, satisfactorily to him.

LORD HARRIS: I shall be happy to hear what the noble Earl has to say privately; but we are accustomed to wander rather wide in our discussions, and I cannot see why the noble Earl cannot now give me an Answer to my Question.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: The Motion before us protests against the abolition of the Militia, and I think I should be detaining your Lordships at too great length if I entered into those other subjects now. I do not wish to complain, but I think I have a right to say that the attitude of His Majesty's Government towards the Militia has been misunderstood. I think that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War made perfectly plain in his speech in another place his exact attitude in respect to this question. I know it would not be in order for me to quote from that speech, but I am perfectly in order in referring to the Memorandum which has been circulated to your Lordships. There are some three or four paragraphs on pages 11 and 12 dealing with this question. My right hon. friend says most distinctly 'that no sweeping change in the general position of the Militia force, or in the strength of its units, is at present contemplated; and your Lordships must be perfectly aware that nothing in the nature of large organic changes can be carried out until the Estimates for next year have been presented to Parliament. At the same time we do regard the position of the Militia at the present moment as serious. I do not for a moment depreciate what the Militia have done in the past, but the Report of the Royal Commission recently presented to your Lordships' House shows how very serious the position of the Militia now is. The Commission stated in their Report that the average strength of 104,000 yielded only 82,000 Militiamen fit as regards age to take the field. In Continental armies (the Commission pointed out) men are not taken before the age of twenty, and if we adopted that age as the lowest for field service, and deducted the men who had not reached that age, the effective total was reduced to 69,000 men, out of an establishment of 130,000. The Commission also stated that the evidence which they had received satisfied them that the drill and training at present undergone by the Militia force was insufficient to fit its units, at short notice, to meet trained troops in the field.

LORD RAGLAN: There have been no classes held for several years to which Militia officers could go. You close the classes to them, and then tell them they are untrained.

***THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE**: I think the noble Earl will find a great many other reasons in the evidence given before the Commission. The reason I have quoted is not the sole reason. I am not claiming too much when I say that the evil is an organic one more than accidental, as the noble Lord seems to suggest. Indeed, there is no more convincing proof of the bad condition in which the Militia find themselves at the present moment than is to be found in the speeches of the noble Lord himself. I read very carefully this afternoon the speech which the noble Lord made on the occasion of the debate raised by my noble friend Lord Newton, in which he advocated compulsory service, and I find complete corroboration of almost everything I have just quoted from the Report of the Royal Commission. The position is a very serious one. The chief evils, as we believe, arise from the fact that the Militia competes with the Line for recruits, a competition which the noble Lord, Lord Harris, does not very much deprecate because he thinks it is a very useful thing to have the Militia as a feeder for the Line. But I venture to say that a Militia at £1,800,000 supplying 19,000 recruits for the Line, though perhaps an excellent thing, is a luxury which we ought to try and cheapen if we can.

Again, we are confronted with the fact that the Volunteers compete with the Militia for recruits. Militia colonels are complaining to us that a great many officers and men find their way into the Volunteers instead of, as they did in former times, into the Militia. We also recognise as an evil the want of trained officers and non-commissioned officers. My noble friend Lord Raglan suggested that we could get a large number of officers for the Militia if we give them a retaining fee of £100 per annum. If we did that I cannot imagine any officers going into the Army as subalterns at £120. We are also confronted with the fact that the Militia are in no way organised for war. It is necessary to find some alleviation for this state of affairs. The Army Council have decided that it is necessary to at once raise the physical standard of the Militia to the level of the Line. We also feel that we should be doing wrong if we attempted to continue in existence or unamalgamated, if I may use the phrase, certain units which are at the present moment absolutely redundant; but we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that these expedients may only prove to be palliatives, and that some large organic change may be found to be necessary. But it has never been suggested that in any organic change which may be made it will be necessary absolutely to abolish the Militia. For that reason I can assure the noble Earl that I have no objection to the Motion.

The question of the Irish Militia has been raised in the course of the debate. That is a very important question, and I can assure the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition that it will be kept in view in connection with the consideration of the whole scheme. As to the point raised by Lord Raglan with reference to the future position of commanding officers, he will, of course, remember that it was suggested in the evidence before the Norfolk Commission that the position of the commanding officer is at present very unsatisfactory. He has no power to command except while the regiment is out training. It has been suggested that commanding officers should be allowed to give attention to their regiments all the year round, which would not separate them very much from the position of commanding officers of one of the home-service battalions if the recommendations of my right hon. friend are carried out.

Lord BURGHCLERE: My Lords, I am unwilling to trouble your Lordships with any remarks at this late hour, but as I had the honour of initiating a debate a week or so ago on the Army scheme, and as I have been particularly invited into this discussion by the noble Earl, Lord Wemyss, I hope your Lordships will allow me for a few minutes to address you on this subject. My noble friend, in inviting me to take part in this debate, said that on a previous occasion I had at a point in my speech kissed my hand to him. I do not remember, my Lords, that I ever took such a liberty with my noble friend; but I must admit that I never hear him address this House in his strenuous and vigorous fashion without wishing to take off my hat to him. I have only risen to endeavour to elucidate the rather hazy condition in which, if I may say so, the Under-Secretary has left the question, and to elicit from the Government some definite statement as to what really are their opinions with regard, not to the abolition of the Militia, but to the absorption and amalgamation of the Militia.

The Earl of Donoughmore.

The Under-Secretary told us just now that we had entirely misunderstood the Secretary of State as to his attitude with regard to the Militia. I would venture to draw my noble friend's attention to the Secretary of State's Memorandum which has been circulated in this House. We find in it the deliberate statement of the Secretary of State to this effect—

> "There will be an improvement in the Militia, and, if public opinion will allow, the amalgamation of the Militia with the Line for the purpose of forming a true territorial Army."

I think it is quite clear, from the speech of the Secretary of State for War and from this document, what is in the mind of the Secretary of State with regard to the future of the Militia. I do not think the Under-Secretary will deny that the plan of the Secretary of State is to create a territorial Army. Having accepted the theory of the blue water school, the Secretary of State proposes that the Army shall be smaller than hitherto, but we hope it is to be more efficient; and in endeavouring to form that Army the Secretary of State proposes to absorb, I think, thirty-three battalions of the Militia, and to abolish the remaining Militia battalions in order that he may effect a certain economy. What that economy is was referred to just now by the noble Earl the Under-Secretary. It is the £1,800,000 a year, which is the present cost of maintaining 91,000 members of the Militia force in order, as he put it, to give to the Regular Army 19,000 recruits per annum. The noble Earl insinuated that that was a very large sum to pay for these recruits.

If the Secretary of State proposes to absorb these thirty-three Militia battalions, and to abolish the rest, it is quite obvious that, in accepting this Motion, the Under-Secretary of State is not carrying out the plan of his chief, nor the plan which he himself was good enough to give to your Lordships the other night, and which he strangely said proceeded from the Army Council and not from the Cabinet. I do not speak with any experience of these high offices; but, in the case of the Admiralty, it would seem a most extraordinary doctrine if the Lords of the Admiralty were to initiate a policy of a far-reaching nature and of vital importance to the very existence of this country, and then, when it came before Parliament, we were to be told by His Majesty's Government that it was not they who were responsible for it, but the Admiralty Board. That is a doctrine which has never before been placed before your Lordships or the country.

I venture to say, with all respect to His Majesty's Government, that the official acceptance of my noble friend's Motion is the last phase in the decline and fall of that great scheme of Army reorganisation which appeared before the country with such a flourish of trumpets a short time ago. When I last spoke, the noble Marquess, with great good nature, twitted me because I had said that the basis of this plan was the acceptance of the doctrine of the blue water school. The Government having accepted this Resolution, I hope I shall not offend the literary susceptibilities of the noble Marquess when I say that the scheme of the Government is now many fathoms deep below the blue water, and is likely to remain there, and I do not think in any effective form it will float on that blue water again.

The noble Earl the Under-Secretary told us the other night that the amalgamation of the Militia and its absorption with the Line was part of the Army scheme. Shortly afterwards the Leader of your Lordships' House told us that this was not the final scheme of the Government. Then, I ask, with all respect, what on earth was this Memorandum circulated to Parliament for? We do not want to hear from His Majesty's Government what they are not agreed upon. We want to hear from them what they are agreed upon. Yet by the confession of the noble Marquess, and the position in which that scheme is now placed, it is obvious that it represents what the Government are not agreed upon, and in no sense what they are agreed upon. I should like to know how the noble Marquess explains that position. The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition said he would support my noble friend if he went to a division. Luckily for us we are not to have a division. For myself, I am bound to say I feel some difficulty in giving an unqualified assent to the Motion now before the House. At the same time, I fully associate myself with what has been said with regard to the past services of the Militia, and the way in which they behaved from Waterloo to the Crimea, and more recently in South Africa. The noble Lord opposite, Lord Raglan, would tell us that our proper territorial Army is the constitutional force, the Militia.

LORD RAGLAN: Hear, hear!

LORD BURGHCLERE: It is obvious that the territorial Army will be mainly composed of the Militia. We know that at present recruiting for the Militia is not what we desire it to be, and it does not follow that in the future more recruits will be forthcoming. It is quite possible that recruiting will be more difficult. You will have a small territorial Army mainly composed of the Militia, and when your recruiting falls off, what will happen? Why, those noble Lords who favour conscription will come forward and point to the depletion of your only territorial force, and when some scare occurs, they will at once urge that the Ballot Act should be put in force; thus will come in the thin end of the wedge of conscription. I, for my part, being an opponent of conscription, do not wish to see such a result. By the admission of the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary, it is obvious that the Militia force will have to be strengthened and improved, and if you strengthen and improve it, it may be that you will have to alter its constitutional position, especially as regards service abroad. I think it would be very difficult to constitute the territorial Army largely of the Militia without imposing the obligation to serve abroad. You will thereby alter the whole constitution of the Militia force, and if you tie yourselves down to an abstract proposal like the one now before the House, you will find it difficult to explain your position when the difficulty arises.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I trust you will allow me to say a few words in reply to my noble friend. I desire to speak in a double capacity—as

First Lord of the Admiralty and therefore a responsible member of His Majesty's Government, and also as a Militia officer. First of all, may I say a word for myself as a Militia officer? I have served twenty-five years in the Militia, and although my active career in that force is closed, I have still the great honour to be hon. colonel of the regiment in which I served, and my attachment to the Militia is not less than that of my noble friend, Lord Raglan, who has addressed the House with such consummate knowledge of the subject. Having made quite clear what my personal attitude towards the Militia is, I feel bound to say, as Lord Raglan would say, that the condition of the Militia at the present moment is profoundly unsatisfactory. I must allow myself a little licence on this occasion. I do say, with a full sense of my responsibility, that the condition to which the Militia has been brought has been the work of the War Office and nobody else—not the particular War Office existing at the present moment, not the War Office of any one Government, but the War Office as I have known it throughout my Militia service of twenty-five years. The Militia is what the War Office have made it, and the War Office alone is responsible for all its failures and shortcomings.

In the whole of my service, with the exception of one or two officers I could name, I have never found, be it Liberal Government or Conservative Government in power, any sympathy at the War Office for the Militia except from the civilians. The military officials at the War Office knew nothing about the Militia; the conditions of service in the Militia were so different from those to which they had been accustomed that they never seemed able to exercise their imagination; they never seemed to realise that there could be a force whose conditions were different from those of the Regular Army, or that any force other than Regular soldiers could be of any value. They regarded the Militia as if it never could be anything else than a recruiting ground for the Line. I do think that successive military administrators at the War Office have, in all their dealings with the Auxiliary Forces, been most short-sighted. They have been unable to raise their eyes beyond the immediate needs, as it seems to me, of the Regular Army, and they have grudged for the Auxiliary Forces any money that they could get for the Regulars.

The Earl of Selborne.

Now, my Lords, that is the past. What about the future? The Army Council have devised a scheme which has the complete acquiescence and cordial approval of the Government, and for which the Government are absolutely responsible. It is the division of the Army into a general-service Army and a home-service Army. What part in that reorganisation is the Militia to play? That is the question. Nobody can doubt that that part must be played in the home-service Army, and, whatever particular method of adaptation to the home-service Army you may favour for the Militia, the changes that must come will be drastic. My noble friend who spoke last put his finger on the most drastic change of all, and one which, speaking as an individual Member of your Lordships' House, seems to me to lie at the root of the whole question. Whether the scheme described in the Memorandum of the Secretary of State for War or any other scheme is adopted, the Militia of the future in the home Army must be a force bound to serve abroad in a defined case of national emergency—a voluntarily raised, not a compulsorily raised, force.

The days have gone by, I hope, for enlisting men for home service and expecting them to volunteer in time of war for foreign service. That has been done time after time, century after century almost, and I think it is full time that that fraud should cease. The Militia always have been required for foreign service in great wars and always will be. The question is how to adapt them for the home-service Army. The Army Council have adopted a wise attitude, and one for which the Government wholly accept responsiblity. They have said—

"We are dealing with a force of immense historical antiquity, as old an institution as exists in this country, except perhaps Parliament, the Church, and the Monarchy. It is a force that has done national service in war after war, and in emergency after emergency, and we cannot deal with such a force as that hastily."

They have, in fact, adopted the advice which the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition and the noble and gallant Field-Marshal Lord Roberts gave the other night; they have not acted hastily. They have put the conditions before the Militia force and before Parliament and the whole country, and they have said, "These are the conditions—We must have a home Army; the Militia must be in the home Army." And they might have added that the Militia must be available for foreign service; how are you going to adapt the Militia to these conditions? They adumbrated a plan of their own, a plan which, if successful, would give a very valuable body of men and officers, and their contention is that it does not amount to an abolition of the Militia. They admit, of course, that the career which has been such a pleasure to my noble friend and to myself, to rise through one's regiment as a county gentleman to command it—they admit that that will be closed. Up to the rank of major they say the career would still be open, and they believe that in time of war there would be full employment in the battalions that will have to be improvised for those senior Militia officers for whom permanent employment had not been found in time of peace. Therefore, the view that this is really the abolition of the Militia force is not the view that the Army Council admit, and those who want fairly to discuss this question must remember that that is the point of view of the Army Council. Not only do they say it is not proposed to abolish the Militia, but they say that the Militia is necessary to make the territorial Army what they hope to see it. They say they cannot with a few Line regiments spread the territorial organisation over the country. They want the historical and territorial prestige of the Militia to help them in striking even deeper and fuller the roots of the territorial system.

Lord BURGHCLERE: How many battalions of the Militia do the Army Council propose to abolish? They propose, I understand, to amalgamate thirty-three battalions. How many do they propose to abolish?

The Earl of SELBORNE: I frankly admit I cannot tell you. A large number would disappear as units. The Army Council say that whatever they do they will have to amalgamate many of the existing units, because they have fallen below the numbers necessary to enable them to maintain them as separate units. Whichever plan they adopt they will have to do a great deal of amalgamation. The Army Council say to the Militia, "Can you show us any better plan which, for the same money, will give us an equally valuable force of Militia, or which, for less money, will give us a larger force of Militia, adequately trained for the needs of the country"? That is the problem which they put before the Militia and the country, and there is no shirking of responsibility on the part of the Government. It is with their full and entire sanction that the Army Council have come forward and taken the public into their confidence. That is the problem which we have all got to discuss. It is not and never can be a Party question. It is a national question. How, without losing any of the great historical value of the Militia, are we to weld that force into the new home Army so as to get the fullest possible value for our money, and supply the country with the largest possible number of men?—that is the problem before us, and the contributions we have had to-night from noble Lords, and which we shall have more of in the future, are of the greatest assistance in elucidating this problem.

***The Earl of WEMYSS**: I gathered from the speech of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary that the Government accept my Resolution declaring that it would be contrary to sound policy to get rid of the Militia, which is the foundation of our military system. While defending the Government from any intention of abolishing the Militia, or of absorbing the whole of it, he spoke of organic changes that will have to be made. What I wish to ask the noble Earl is this—Will Parliament have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon those organic changes before they are made? I venture to think that anything which makes an organic change in the Militia force ought to be brought before Parliament in the early part of the session, so that Parliament and the public may have full opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: The noble Lord will realise that it is impossible to make any important organic change in any part of the Army without having authority in the Estimates. We cannot do anything in connection with this part of the scheme until next year's Estimates.

On Question, resolved in the affirmative.

ARMY COUNCIL BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, it may be in the recollection of your Lordships that when I had the honour of addressing you a month ago on the Report of the Esher Committee, and explaining the terms of the Order in Council which would be submitted to your Lordships, I also explained that there were certain statutory powers of the Secretary of State which it was intended to transfer by Act of Parliament to the Army Council. This is a Bill to carry that out. There are a number of statutory powers, mostly enumerated in the Army Act, the Reserve Forces Acts, and the Militia Acts. They are chiefly small but very important powers. There are also statutory powers which were until lately vested in the Commander-in-Chief and the Adjutant-General, the principal one being the power to reduce a non-commissioned officer to the ranks. The operative part of this Bill is to be found in Clause 1, Sub-section 1, while Sub-section 2 of Clause 1 vests property that has hitherto been vested in the Secretary of State for War in the Army Council. We are in this Bill following the precedent of the Admiralty.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I think this is a Bill of greater importance than appears from the statement made by the noble Earl in moving it. It apparently places the Army Council on something like the same footing as the Board of Admiralty, but there is a great distinction between the two, and I believe there will be very great opposition to the proposal to remove these powers from the Secretary of State. It is impossible at this late hour of the evening, and in the present condition of the House, to go into details; but there will be considerable opposition to diverting powers from the Secretary of State, who is responsible to Parliament, to the Army Council, for we know very little about the Army Council at the present moment. The Army Council, so far as I know, stands on a perfectly different basis from that of the Board of Admiralty. The latter are not appointed for a fixed time. When the Government go out the whole of the Board of Admiralty cease to hold office; but I am told that by the Patent constituting the Army Council the military members of that Council are appointed for four years.

Another question which has never, to my mind, been quite cleared up, is the relative position of the Secretary of State and the members of the Army Council. There is no doubt whatever as to the First Lord of the Admiralty and the members of the Board of Admiralty. The First Lord can, if he chooses, overrule the majority of the Board. It may be so with regard to the Secretary of State and the Army Council, but I have heard it distinctly stated by those who have studied the subject that the Secretary of State, and the Under-Secretary of State, who is also a member of the Army Council, are merely equals with the other members, and that the Secretary of State cannot overrule, if necessary, the remainder of the Army Council. There is also the question as to the number of members of that Council who may be in Parliament. There is no Act of Parliament dealing with that in the case of the Board of Admiralty. In the old days nearly all the members of the Board were in Parliament, but of late years that has not been so, The only person on the Board of Admiralty who cannot be a Member of Parliament is the Controller. Though it may be advisable sometimes to have members of the Army Council and the Board of Admiralty in Parliament, I think it would lead under modern circumstances to a very grave and serious difficulty.

It would be an extremely awkward position, but it is one which, considering the constitution of the Army Council and the fact that the members have a tenure of four years, might arise if a new Secretary of State of a different political complexion suddenly found himself confronted in the House of Commons with military members of the Council who were opposed to him and the Government. I feel that this is a very serious matter. My copy of this Bill only arrived yesterday morning, and I have not had time to properly look into the question; but friends to whom I have mentioned the matter have expressed their astonishment at the proposal, and I am certain there will be in another place, even if we pass the Bill here, serious opposition to it, particularly as it greatly affects the position, which, has long been defined, of the Secretary of State and his responsibility to Parliament. I therefore greatly depreciate the Bill being passed in this hurried way, at this late period of the session, and I should be disposed to divide against it if the noble Earl presses it to-night.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I sincerely trust the noble Earl will allow this Bill to be read a second time, because I think I can satisfy him on every point he has raised. It is my happiness in this class of question always to agree with the noble Earl. The intention has been to follow the practice of the Board of Admiralty in every particular and down to the smallest detail. The difference is this. The constitution or the powers of the Board of Admiralty are not to be found in any Act of Parliament, but there are a series of Acts which devolve special responsibilities and special duties upon some of the members of the Army Council, particularly upon the Secretary of State, and that is why this Bill is necessary. The Bill must be read with the Army Patent and the Order in Council which is shortly coming out. In that Order in Council it will be found that the responsibility of the Secretary of State is absolutely defined and insisted upon. He will be as solely responsible to the Sovereign and to Parliament as the First Lord of the Admiralty is at the present moment, and he will be in a position to overrule, in a last resort, all his colleagues on the Army Council. I think all the points to which the noble Earl has drawn attention will be found to be met in the three documents on which the constitutional basis of the Army Council will henceforward rest—this Bill (if it passes into law), the Patent, and the Order in Council. In regard to the provisions limiting the number of members of the Army Council who may at one time hold seats in the House of Commons, that is a departure from the practice that obtains in connection with the Board of Admiralty, and we shall be ready to reconsider it in Committee. Each successive Government will have the power at any moment of issuing a new Patent and having a new Army Council, just as it has the power of issuing a new Patent and having a new Board of Admiralty. Therefore the case will not arise, where you can have members of the Army Council in the House of Commons at variance politically with the Government of the day.

*EARL SPENCER: Am I correct in saying that under the Patent, the military members of the Army Council are appointed for four years?

*THE EARL OF SELBORNE: I understand that you are incorrect. There is no limit at all. The Esher Committee recommended it, but it was not put into the Patent. That accounts, no doubt, for the misconception. We shall be prepared to reconsider in Committee the provision limiting the number of members of the Army Council who shall sit in the House of Commons, in order to bring it on exactly the same lines as the documents that prescribe the proceedings of the Board of Admiralty. I hope that after this explanation the noble Lord will at any rate allow the Bill to be read a second time.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

WILD BIRDS PROTECTION ACTS AMENDMENT (ST. KILDA) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

DEAN FOREST BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

COUNTY COURTS BILL [H.L.]

Amendments reported (according to order).

*LORD COLERIDGE explained that the object of the two Amendments standing in his name was to leave the option perfectly free on the part of plaintiffs to bring their actions in the County Court or in the High Court, in cases where the jurisdiction of the County Court was enlarged from £50 to £100. If the Bill remained as at present the plaintiff would be forced into the County Court, possibly against his will, in actions between £50 and £100, and he would be penalised because if he recovered less than £100 he would not be entitled to any more costs than he would have been entitled to if he had brought his original action in the County Court. He could not conceive that it was intended to penalise plaintiffs in this way. The object of the Bill was a very salutary one, namely, to enlarge the jurisdiction so that plaintiffs should not be precluded from bringing actions in the County Court in claims for more than £50; and he hoped the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack would see his way to accept the Amendments, which would greatly improve the usefulness of the measure.

Amendments moved—

"In page 1, Clause 1, line 12, after the word 'eighty-one,' to insert the word 'and'; and in line 13, to leave out the words 'and one-hundred and sixteen.'"—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY said he did not intend to resist the Amendments, as he thought the application of the section to which the noble and learned Lord had referred was the result of an error. He therefore accepted the Amendments.

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY proposed the insertion of a new clause to meet the case of deputy high bailiffs.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 6, to insert as a new clause the words, 'Section thirty-one of the principal Act as to the appointment of deputy registrars shall apply to the appointment of deputy high bailiffs, with the substitution of the words 'high bailiff' for the word 'registrar.'"—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY moved to add to Section (1) of Clause 11, which provided that—

"A person liable to be fined under Section forty-eight of the principal Act shall be liable to be imprisoned, with or without hard labour, for any period not exceeding two months if so ordered by the Judge or on summary conviction."

the words contained in his Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 11, page 5, line 4, after the word 'conviction' to insert the words 'and the said section shall apply to any case in which any officer or bailiff of any Court or any person put into possession of goods seized under any process of the Court by a bailiff of any Court is assaulted or obstructed while in the execution of his duty, and to any case of rescue or attempted rescue of any person arrested under process of the Court.'"—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY explained that his next Amendment was necessary owing to the City of London Court not being technically a County Court.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 12, to insert as a new clause, 'The extended jurisdiction exercisable in County Courts under this Act shall be exercisable in like manner in the City of London.'"—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 172.)

POOR LAW AUTHORITIES (TRANSFER OF PROPERTY) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order).

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

Clause 5.

EARL WALDEGRAVE said the Amendment which he had to move to Clause 5 explained itself. Its object was to make it clear that the Bill did not apply to Ireland.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 5, page 2, line 36, to insert as a new sub-section, '(1) This Act shall not extend to Ireland.'"—(*Earl Waldegrave.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived: The Report of Amendment to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 173.)

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland—Was presented by the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 167.)

House adjourned at five minutes past Eight o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 29th July, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill; Torquay Tramways Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered. Two Clauses added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

King's College Hospital Bill [Lords]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords] (by Order). As amended, considered; a Clause added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time upon Tuesday next.

Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Considered; to be read the third time upon Tuesday next

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill; Felixstowe Gas Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill; South Shields Gas Bill, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Broughton Moor; Coton in the Elms; Kirkham;

North Cave; and South Shields; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Farnworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petitions from Morecambe, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain. Vol. I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF HERTFORD).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Hertford redividing the Mid or St. Albans Parliamentary Division into Polling Districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF HERTFORD).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Hertford redividing the Eastern or Hertford Parliamentary Division into Polling Districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 21st July; *Mr. Lloyd Morgan*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.]

DEATHS FROM STARVATION OR ACCELERATED BY PRIVATION (LONDON).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 3rd March; *Mr. Talbot*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289.]

COUNTY AND BOROUGH LUNATIC ASYLUMS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 13th June; *Mr. Charles Hobhouse*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 290.]

SHOPS.

Return presented, relative thereto Address 13th June; *Sir Charles Dilke*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 291.]

MOTOR CARS (LICENCES).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th April; *Mr. Scott Montagu*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 292.]

WOOLLEN, WORSTED, AND SHODDY FACTORIES (INSPECTION).

Return presented, relative thereto [Addresss 2nd May; *Mr. Wanklyn*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 293.]

COMMITTEE OF IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 4th May, 1904, as to Secretariat [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the principal and other Foreign Countries in each year from 1892 to 1901–2 (Thirtieth Number) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

METROPOLITAN GAS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to Gas Testing in the Metropolis. Part II. Evidence and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAMWAY ORDERS.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under The Tramways Act, 1870, during the Session of 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING, 1903.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th July; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 294.]

COAL TABLES, 1903.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th July; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 295.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Vote for National Gallery of Scotland.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of a general desire on the part of Scotch Members to discuss the recent Report of the Committee on the Board of Manufactures, he will put down the Vote for the National Gallery of Scotland for an early day.

(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I hope there may be a further opportunity for taking Scotch Estimates, when the Vote in question will be put down.

Suggested Appointment of Additional Judges in the King's Bench Division.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that the present number of Judges in the King's Bench Division leaves no margin of reserve whatever for illness or temporary absence, the Government will consider the advisability of increasing the number.

(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am advised that the power which is exercised whenever required of appointing Commissioners of Assize, affords just such relief as the Question suggests, and such a Commissioner is acting at the present time. I also understand that the state of business does not call for any other help.

Thames Barrage Scheme.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the impossibility of carrying the Port of London Bill, he will now accede to the request of the Corporation of the City of London and the Thames Conservancy Board for a Departmental inquiry into the practicability of the Thames barrage scheme, to be carried on during the recess, so that a decision may be arrived at and the views of engineers ascertained before further legislation is undertaken during next session of Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I fear I can only repeat what I have already stated, namely, that there does not appear to be sufficient expert support for the project in question to justify the inquiry suggested by my hon. friend.

Contracts in Connection with London Telephone Service—British *v.* Foreign Firms.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the value of the contracts given to British and foreign firms respectively, during the last five years, for plant required in connection with the London telephone service, and the nature of such plant.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The value of the contracts placed with British and foreign firms respectively for plant required in connection with the London telephone service could not be given without an analysis involving much time, labour, and expense. Since 1st April, 1902, orders amounting to about £109,000 have been issued for the equipment of exchanges in London. These exchanges are worked on the central battery system, and most of the orders had to be given to a foreign firm who held numerous patents for such apparatus. The circumstances are gradually altering, and I hope it will before long be possible to obtain telephones for the use of subscribers from British makers only.

Establishment of a Post Office in Wapping west of Wapping Bridge.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: To ask the Postmaster-General, having regard to the fact that the Wapping post and telegraph office, situated at Old Gravel Lane, east of Wapping Bridge, is not available to firms in business west of the bridge on the occasions when the bridge is open, will he state whether it has yet been found possible to secure premises suitable for the establishment of a post office in Wapping west of Wapping Bridge.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I regret to say that it has not yet been found possible to secure suitable premises for the establishment of a post office in the locality to which the hon. Member refers.

Withdrawals from Post Office Savings Bank.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the number of withdrawals from the Post Office Savings Bank for the year ending the 31st December last, and the total amount of such withdrawals.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The number of withdrawals for all purposes from the Post Office Savings Bank for the year ending the 31st December last was 6,180,419, and the amount £42,786,025. The total amount standing to the credit of depositors at the end of the year was £146,135,147, as against £144,605,088 at the end of the previous year.

Post Office Savings Bank—Deposits of Small Amounts.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Postmaster-General, in view of the determination to abolish the practice of sending out from the head office acknowledgments for deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank under £1, will he state how many deposits of 15s. and upwards, and how many of 10s. and under 15s. were received during the year ending 31st December last, or any previous year; and will he state the number of Post Office Savings Banks in the United Kingdom conducted at shops or other places where the clerks are not in the pay of the Postmaster-General.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There are no statistics available to enable me to reply to the first part of the hon. Member's Question; and the compilation of such statistics would involve a very large amount of labour. As regards the second part, Savings Bank business is conducted at about 12,800 post offices where the staff employed, other than the sub-postmaster or mistress, are not in the direct pay of the Postmaster-General.

Delay in Introduction of Electric Traction on Metropolitan and Metropolitan District Railways.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the cause of the delay in introducing electric traction on the Metropolitan and Metropolitan District Railways; and by what date these lines will be working under the new system.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have communicated with the railway companies concerned on the subject of the hon. Member's Question and have received replies, of which I am sending him copies.

Duties and Prices of Imported Wheat in the United Kingdom and on the Continent.

Dr. SHIPMAN (Northampton): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what were the duties on imported wheat in the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Italy, respectively, at the end of June, 1904; what were the average prices of wheat in each of these countries at that time; whether these average prices include the home-grown as well as the imported wheat; and, if so, what are the estimated percentages of imported and home-grown wheat in the total wheat supply of each of these countries.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The following gives the information desired by the hon. Member so far as available:—

Countries.	Duties on imported wheat per cwt.	Average prices of wheat per cwt.	Basis and date of price.	Approximate percentage of home-grown wheat to total supply (five years 1899-1903).
	s. d.	s. d.		
United Kingdom	Nil.	6 2	Gazette average price of British wheat (last week in June)	22½
		6 10	Average price of imported wheat (June)	
Germany . .	1 9¼	8 7½	Berlin official market price at June 30th	66
France . .	2 10¼	8 2¾	Paris official price at June 25th	98*
Italy . . .	3 0	9 7½	Mean market price June 19th	82

Home-grown wheat appears to be iucluded in the average prices published by all the above foreign countries.

---

* Average of four years 1899—1902.

Ventilation of House of Commons—Firms Invited to Tender for New Plant.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he will state the names of the firms invited to tender for the new ventilating plant required for the better ventilation of the House of Commons; and, seeing that the recommendations given by James Keith and Company before a Parliamentary Committee have been largely adopted, will he say why this firm was not invited to tender.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The type of inlet fan selected for the work now in progress is that manufactured by Messrs. Matthews and Yates of Manchester. Whatever recommendations may have been made by Mr. Keith, they do not govern the question of the exact type of appliances to be used in giving effect to the Committee's independent decisions. The order for the extracting fan has not yet been placed owing to certain structural difficulties which have arisen. The remainder of the appliances have been designed in the Office of Works and it is not proposed to apply to manufacturers of specialities in this connection.

Erection of New National School at Hatfield.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the Hertfordshire County Council has voted £750 towards the cost of building a new national school at Hatfield on the understanding that certain rooms will be available for higher education; whether this method of aiding elementary education was adopted after consultation with the Board of Education, as required by Section 2, Sub-section (1) of the Education Act, 1902; and if so, what advice or directions did the Board of Education give to the Hertfordshire County Council in the matter.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) If I understand the Question rightly, it suggests that the Hertfordshire County Council are assisting to provide premises for a voluntary school, and moreover that they are doing so out of funds which should be devoted to secondary education. A local authority which contemplated such an infraction of the law would be unlikely to consult the Board of Education as to the course which they were adopting. The Board are aware that rooms for technical instruction are included in the plans for a new voluntary school at Hatfield, but they have no reason to suppose that these rooms are not being provided by the managers. The Board will, however, inquire into the matter.

Money due to the Commissioners of Public Works by the Irish Society.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how much money is at present due by the Honourable the Irish Society on foot of the mortgages held by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on their Irish estates, the dates upon which the various amounts were advanced, the rate or rates of interest payable therefor, the original sum advanced in each case, and the purposes for which the advances were made.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) A sum of £13,000 was lent by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland on the 6th December, 1888, to the Irish Society in aid of the erection of a town hall in Londonderry. The interest charged is 4 per cent. and the amount of principal at present unpaid is £5,200. In the absence of detailed particulars of the lands, etc., comprised in the estates of the society, it cannot be stated whether there are any other loans outstanding upon them.

Legal Assistance under the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of the Lord Chief Justice, when charging the grand jury at Warwick on Saturday last, that prisoners who desired legal assistance, under the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, 1903, ought, when before the magistrates, to disclose their defence, so that the same could be duly investigated; and, if so, will he draw the attention of the magistrates, through the usual channels, to the direction of the learned Judge, seeing that magistrates do not generally adopt this course.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have seen a report of the

Lord Chief Justice's charge to the grand jury at Warwick, and I propose to have it printed and circulated to magistrates throughout the country. I may add that I have already given directions that placards explaining the provisions of the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act shall be posted in all prison cells where persons are confined on remand or committal for trial.

Suggested Increase of Wages for Unskilled Labour in Devonport Dockyard.

Mr. BENN (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the rise in rents in the town of Devonport and the increased cost of food, he will consider the desirability of raising, in proportion, the minimum wage of unskilled workers in the Dockyard services.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) This question, with others, will be carefully considered, and a decision conveyed to the men in answer to their petitions through the usual official channels.

Petitions of Devonport Dockyard Workers.

Mr. BENN: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will explain why certain petitions sent in last October by workers in the Dockyard services at Devonport still remain unanswered, notwithstanding a promise that they should receive attention early in the present year.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) As far as I am aware no promise was made that the petitions would receive early attention this year. The petitions referred to remain unanswered because the mass of evidence taken by the Board upon the Dockyard workmen's petitions requires o be carefully digested and considered. This is being done with as little delay as possible.

By-laws made by Irish Local Authorities under the Employment of Children Act.

Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what local authorities have made by-laws under the Employment of Children Act, 1903; and whether, in any cases, the sanction of the Lord-Lieutenant has been withheld; and, if so, upon what grounds.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The municipal councils of Dublin and Cork. The by-laws made by the Corporation of Cork have been confirmed by the Lord-Lieutenant; those made by the Corporation of Dublin have not yet been finally submitted for confirmation. These are the only two cases in which by-laws have been made, so far as the Government is aware.

1st Battalion Lancashire Fusiliers — Prolonged Service Abroad.

Sir LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if, in consideration of the fact that the 1st battalion Lancashire Fusiliers after being stationed at Malta and Gibraltar, is now under orders to return to Malta, he will state whether there is any special reason why it should be continually stationed in the Mediterranean, where it has been since August 1899; and whether he can so vary the published programme of moves as to prevent this battalion from a prolonged sojourn abroad.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The 1st battalion Lancashire Fusiliers went abroad in 1899, and it has been found necessary to retain it in the Mediterranean up to the present; but every endeavour will be made, as regards this battalion, as is done in the case of others, to give it its fair proportion of Indian as well as of Colonial service. The South African War has necessarily caused a certain dislocation in the ordinary relief arrangements. There is no intention of keeping this battalion abroad for more than its normal period of foreign service.

Constitution of New Army Finance Department.

Mr. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the circular letter sent to officers on probation for the Army Pay Department which modifies the conditions of service hitherto prevailing, he is now in a position to announce the constitution of the new Army Finance Department, and the position of the officers of the Army Pay Department in relation to it.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The circular letter referred to does not modify the conditions of service, but merely draws attention to the fact that in future, under the new organisation, the duties to be performed by officers of the Army Pay Department will be somewhat extended, and will include accounting for stores as well as cash. I am not yet in a position to announce the constitution of the new Army Accounts Department; but there is no intention of altering the *status* of the officers of the Army Pay Department.

Number and Cost of British Troops Stationed in South Africa—Colonial Contributions to Cost.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the total number of British troops now stationed in South Africa; what is the total annual cost of these troops, and what contribution, if any, is made by the Colonial Governments to that cost.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The total number of British troops in South Africa is 21,500, and their annual cost amounts to £3,100,000. No contribution is made by the Colonial Governments, except in the case of Natal, which pays £4,000 a year.

Number and Cost of British Troops Stationed at Canadian Ports—Canadian Contributions to Cost.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War what number of British troops are stationed at Esquimault and Halifax, Nova Scotia, or at other Canadian ports; what is the annual cost of these troops, and what contribution, if any, to that cost is made by the Canadian Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) There are 362 British troops stationed at Esquimault. Their annual cost (including non-effective charges) is about £44,200, and of this sum half (£22,100) is paid as a contribution by the Canadian Government. There are 1,785 British troops stationed at Halifax, Nova Scotia. Their annual cost (including non-effective charges) is about £205,000. No contribution is made in respect of these troops.

Powers and Duties of Secretary of State for War proposed to be Transferred to the Army Council.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can lay before the House a Memorandum showing the powers and duties of the Secretary of State for War which it is proposed to transfer to the Army Council under the Army Council Bill introduced into Parliament on Tuesday last.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The various Acts containing provision for the statutory powers and duties of the Secretary of State for War are so numerous that it would not be practicable to draw up an intelligible Memorandum of the nature desired by the hon. Baronet other than a complete series of extracts from the Acts in question. These Acts (*i.e.*, the unrepealed portions of them) are set forth in a small book prepared for Departmental use, which commences with an Act of 1552 and includes the Acts of 1900. I will send copies of this to the library, and I think this will give all the information required.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the Borough of Reading, in the room of George William Palmer, Esquire (Manor of Northstead). — (*Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

LICENSING BILL.

[Third Reading.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) in moving that the Bill be read the third time upon this day three months, said—In asking the House to take the strong step of rejecting at this stage what I suppose is the principal piece of Government legislation of the session, I justify myself on the double ground of the character of the measure and of the method by which the power of effectual and fruitful discussion of many of its most important provisions has been withdrawn from the House of Commons. No one disputes—certainly no one on this side of the House—that legislation upon this question is urgently needed and long overdue; nor do I believe that those who are called temperance reformers, after something like thirty years of almost unrelieved barrenness of legislation, would have shown any indisposition to receive in a conciliatory and, indeed, in a welcoming spirit any reasonable change, however modest its scope, which seemed to offer even a faint prospect of real advance. It is true that this Bill originated under circumstances which might well warrant a certain amount of preliminary suspicion. Its birth was heralded by rather strange portents. As far as I know, it is the first measure of so-called temperance reform which has ever been introduced in Parliament, not only at the instigation but under stress of the menaces of the trade, by whom—to judge by the evidence one sees around one—throughout its progress and down to this moment it has been received with a warmth of favour which, though judiciously restrained in expression, and sometimes for a few moments altogether disguised, is, I am certain, both fervent and genuine. But although we should not have been prone at the first blush to expect any large instalment of reform from that quarter, yet I can honestly say that, if this Bill had seemed to us to indicate even the line towards a proper solution of the question, we should have been perfectly content not only to judge it on its merits, but to accept what we could get out of it. But the unfortunate fact about the Bill is that the more closely it was examined the more it became apparent that it was a step not forward, but backward, and a step which was attended by this great and formidable disadvantage—that it created, I will not say an insuperable obstacle—of course the power of Parliament backed by public opinion could overcome any obstacle of the kind—but certainly a crop of new interests and of new claims which must in the future seriously embarrass those who approach the solution of the problem in a different spirit. These were the general grounds on which we opposed the Bill on the Second Reading, and it is appropriate at this stage to ask how far the objections which were then taken have been met or mitigated by subsequent changes.

One concession I am very glad to be able to make. I do think the fourth clause, dealing with new licences, has been substantially improved. I welcome that clause because it places in explicit and emphatic terms upon the Statute-book a Parliamentary declaration that as regards all new licences the monopoly value which is created by the public is to be reserved to the public. At the same time I must point out that new licences are but a mere fraction of those with which a licensing measure has to deal, and under the state of things created by this Bill, when every old licence will be incapable of extinction except by payment, the proportion of new licences to old will be smaller than it has ever been. Again, the very improvement which the clause effects in the *status* of the new licensee—who will have no claim to any pecuniary consideration when the term of his licence expires—brings into more startling relief and exaggerates the invidious contrast between him and the holder of an old licence which cannot be got rid of without paying value for it.

While I gladly acknowledge that Clause 4 has been improved, the two main defects of the Bill still remain—I mean, first, its administrative provisions, and next, the method with which it deals with the problem of the renewal of existing licences. As regards the administrative provisions, there are two serious objections which no attempt whatever has been made to meet. The first is that, quite apart from the question whether it is desirable to transfer the authority from the licensing justices to quarter sessions, you have under the new arrangement created by the Bill a splitting up of authority which must from the administrative point of view lead to friction and inefficiency. In the future it will be impossible for either of the authorities to act upon a combination of grounds. The licensing justices may think that the man's record by itself is not bad enough to justify them in taking his licence away, although the interests of the neighbourhood require that it should be taken away. On the other hand, quarter sessions may think that the interests of the neighbourhood alone are not sufficient, though a very little more would suffice to enable them to act upon that ground; and that splitting up of jurisdiction is almost certain to lead in practice to the retention of licences which ought to be abolished, or at any rate to increase the difficulty of dealing with them. That is a practical point which does not raise any question of principle. But behind and beyond that is the much larger objection to the whole of this transfer of jurisdiction that it is a retrograde step. It is taking away the original jurisdiction from a body which has close interest and direct knowledge, and transferring it to a body which has a remote interest and an indirect knowledge. I call it retrograde because it is flying in the face of the whole tendency of legislation in this matter. As far back as 1835, when the Municipal Corporations Bill was before this House, Lord John Russell, who was in charge of the Bill, proposed that the licensing powers should be vested in the borough councils, and the House of Lords alone prevented that change from taking place. To come to more modern times, as recently as 1888 the predecessors of the present Government made a similar proposal when they were creating their county councils. The right hon. Member for Croydon, who was in charge of the Local Government Bill, said—

> "It may be asked whether we do not propose some means whereby the locality shall have some voice in the decision of such an important question as that of licensing. We propose that the county councils shall divide their area out into licensing divisions, and that they shall form a licensing committee for each division to consist of every member elected to the county council for the division, together with an added proportion of selected members from the council."

As far as this Bill goes the proposed transfer from a local body to a more remote body is opposed both to the proposal made in 1835 and to the spirit of the proposals of the right hon. Member for Croydon in 1888.

Then as to the question of policy, which is summed up in the problem of compensation, there are, in my view, only two possible theories of compensation. I can quite understand the position of those who say, like my hon. friend the Member for Camborne, "You ought not to deal with compensation at all." That is a perfectly logical position. But for those who think, as I myself have often said, that for facilitating the solution of this problem the question of compensation must be entertained, there are only two possible theories. The first is the theory that compensation is due to the man whose licence you take away—or rather, to speak more accurately, whose licence is not renewed—as a matter of justice. That is so if a licence can be regarded as a property, I will not say in any intelligible, but in any intelligent sense. If a man's licence is a property, and if it is taken away in the public interest, then on grounds alike of precedent and principle he ought to be compensated for the loss he has sustained. But he ought to be compensated not out of a particular fund earmarked on the ground that it comes from the trade, but compensated, like everybody else whose property is taken away on public grounds for public purposes, out of public funds. That is a perfectly logical view, but it is not the view of the Government. It is quite true that the Prime Minister constantly speaks of licences as if they were property. Yet when he comes to the real test he has not the courage of his convictions, and he will not propose, as he ought to propose, if this is property in the real sense of the word, that the public and the public alone should be burdened with the liability of compensating the owner when it is destroyed. That is the theory of justice. The other theory is the theory of what is sometimes very loosely called equity—a very chaotic and misleading term—and what I prefer to call the theory of expediency. What is the argument for compensation founded upon expediency? It is that in point of practice, although there was no property in a licence at all, there has been an expectation that a licence once given would be from time to time renewed unless there was misconduct, and that there has been consequently a reluctance on the part of the licensing justices to interfere with that expectation and to do their duty to the public. It is upon that ground—the existence of that expectation—and upon that ground alone—that I am prepared to assent to some form of compensation.

But what are the logical consequences to those who take that position? Surely they are these. First of all that you can determine the expectation by reasonable notice in point of time. The expectation is created by the existence of circumstances which raise a belief in the minds of the persons interested that it will be realised. But the moment

Parliament steps in and says, "We give you full warning that after a certain time you are not entitled to entertain such an expectation," the whole foundation disappears. Therefore, it follows that after a reasonable time you should put an end to it. It follows also that your scheme of compensation should be a graduated scheme—that is to say, it should be on a diminishing scale towards the end of the period as compared with what it was at the beginning. If these two conditions are satisfied I will add a third which, to my mind, is equally important, and that is that the fund from which the compensation is to be drawn should be a national and not a local fund. I am perfectly satisfied that a large number of the difficulties which will attend the practical administration of this measure, should it become law, will arise from the fact that you have divided the compensation fund into a set of water-tight compartments, apportioned to each locality, and that it cannot be treated as a whole.

Let me now deal with the only argument which I have yet heard against the justice in theory and practice of the time limit. The Prime Minister says that when we come to the end of the period we shall have precisely the same set of hardships which make it so difficult for the licensing justices to reduce licences as now. Hardship! The publican will have ample notice that his licence may not be renewed, and he will have time to insure himself, if necessary, against that contingency. But it is said that he will have contributed to the compensation fund. As I have said, any logical system of compensation will make it a diminishing contribution, so that in the later years it will be almost nothing. But, apart from that, I say the publican will have got a *quid pro quo*. In the first place, if the Act is to succeed in what is said to be its main purpose—namely, the reduction of redundant licences—it is quite clear that at the end of the period, if reasonably long—say, fourteen years—there will be such a reduction in these licences that redundancy will be a rare thing, and, of course, as redundancy ceases the risk to the publican of losing his licence is small, and it is a risk that could be insured to-morrow in any insurance office in the country. Moreover, the reduction in the amount and stress of competition must surely enhance the value of licences, not only at the end of the period but during the whole period that the process of reduction is going on. I find that, even without any change in the law, between 1900 and 1903 the number of on-licences in London decreased by 7 per cent., although both the population and the consumption of alcohol largely increased in those years; and it is obvious that there must be a greatly enhanced value in the licensed premises which remain. If there was that normal and natural process of reduction during those years, the process ought to be quickened by the compulsory reduction which will come into operation under the Act; and it stands to reason that the publican will be in a much better position, even if there was no compensation fund at all. Besides, there is the material consideration that you will be leaving him in the possession of a valuable interest which the public creates, which exists now only on sufferance, and which by adequate taxation could at any moment be put an end to. We are raising now by the duty on public-house licences in England and Wales the ridiculously inadequate sum of £1,500,000 a year. I find that in the City of New York alone they raise half a million sterling more from the same source of revenue. In England the average rate of licence duty is only £38 a year, while in New York it amounts to £240 a year. Is it not obvious from those figures that we leave to the unfortunate publican who has to contribute to a compensation fund, and whose hard lot excites such sympathy in the bosom of the Prime Minister, a large margin of profit which does not belong to him in equity at all, and which the State has a perfect right to appropriate to itself at any moment? I hope I have made that perfectly clear.

I have one more argument to advance for the rejection of the Bill, and that is derived from the method in which the measure has been handled by its promoters. I have in my hands a printed copy of the Bill, which I hope will be printed and circulated throughout the country. It shows graphically, but by the very simple method of compartments, what parts of the Bill were discussed in Committee or on Report and what remained undiscussed at either or both of those stages. It further shows how many Amendments have been introduced at the instance of the Government without any discussion by anybody at all. I will just summarise the results. There are 264 lines in the Bill as it appears after consideration on Report. Of these 264 lines 54 only have been discussed either in Committee or on the Report stage. That is to say, 210 lines out of 264, or four-fifths, of the Bill have been left entirely undiscussed, and in these 210 lines Government Amendments have been introduced, without consideration or debate, to the amount of 105 lines — exactly one-half. Let me add as to the two schedules that they have been carried without discussion at any time or by any one. The points covered by the undiscussed parts of the Bill include the right of the justices and others to appear before the licensing committee; the basis of compensation; how the amount of compensation is to be ascertained; the division of the compensation, when settled, between the parties interested; who are the parties interested; what appeal there should be; what is to be the amonnt of compensation levied; on whom it is to be made; what are the proportions to be paid by owner and tenant; over what area; what are to be the borrowing powers of the authorities, and what is the character of the rules to be made by the Home Secretary. These are all points of considerable importance and neither in Committee nor on the Report stage have we had an opportunity of considering them. I do not suggest they may not have been incidentally alluded to in the course of the debate, but substantially they are points covered by the undiscussed parts of the Bill. I do not complain in the least of the manner in which the Bill has been conducted within the limits which the Prime Minister has allowed. The Solicitor-General has shown in the conduct of it uniform courtesy, unfailing lucidity, and, I must add, inexhaustible resource. It is not the fault of my right hon. friend that he has not had a more extended field for the display of these admirable Parliamentary qualities in connection with this Bill. I think the Bill is a bad Bill; but whether it is a good Bill or whether it is a bad Bill, surely it ought to be a sufficient reason for its rejection that, good or bad, it is not the handiwork of the House of Commons. It is—to a degree which is wholly unprecedented in a measure which if it once passes this House is reasonably certain to take its place upon the Statute-book—the exclusive and uncorrected composition of the Government and their draftsman, and this House in, being asked to read this Bill a third time, is being invited to perform the function not of a Parliament but of a registry. If I ask the House, as by my Amendment I do, to reject the Bill on Third Reading, I do so because it marks at one and the same time the capitulation of the State to a powerful and organised interest, and the surrender by the House of Commons of its power to mould the law of the land. I beg to move.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University): For the references made by the right hon. Gentleman to myself with regard to the conduct of the Bill I must express my obligations. I received uniform courtesy from both sides of the House, and for that and for many valuable suggestions made by hon. Members I desire to express my warmest thanks. Of course the Government anticipated that the right hon. Gentleman would base the main portion of his speech upon the fact that the discussion has been curtailed. That is always an eloquent topic, and it is always a very unpleasant kind of procedure for Members of this House. I myself have a very vivid recollection, when I was not a very old Member of the House, and when I sat on the Opposition side, of the hardships of the guillotine not upon a question of whether publicans should be allowed to be compensated, but as to whether my own country should be separated from this country. But the truth of the matter is that everybody who has followed these discussions knows perfectly well that the main principles and the main details of the Bill have been discussed *ad nauseum.* The right hon. Gentleman enunciated a certain number of questions which he said had never been touched upon. Why? Because there are a certain number of other questions which have been argued and divided upon five, six, and seven times over. If the House of Commons selects a number of provisions in the Bill as being the main provisions both as to principle and procedure, they can hardly expect, if they discuss these time after time, to leave adequate Parliamentary time for the discussion of the less important matters in that Bill. I noted two admissions of the right hon. Gentleman. He has admitted that for the last thirty years there has been an almost absolute barrenness of effort to deal with this public-house question, and in addition to that he said that this question was quite urgent. That, at all events, is some justification for the Government making an effort to deal with the question.

The right hon. Gentleman said that the genesis of the Bill was what made it so suspicious. I venture to think that there never was a Parliament more pledged to a settlement of this question and upon the lines on which this Bill proceeds than the present Parliament. I am told that out of the total number of Members of this House at least 400 gave pledges at the last election that they would support legislation for preventing licences from being taken away without cause without compensation. The Leader of the Opposition himself in his election address put forward the same idea, limited, I think, to compensation from the trade. That is exactly what this Bill does.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I do not accept the right hon. Gentleman's version of any address.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: I have not the exact words, but I think that is it substantially.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That was an element in it. It was part of a great measure for compulsory reduction of licences throughout the country. With a view to such a reduction I was willing that Parliament should recognise that certain consideration should be given out of their own funds to the dispossessed licensees.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Certainly the right hon. Gentleman has called "compensation" "consideration," but I do not find any substantial difference between my statement and what he has now said. Let me take up the objections which have been made to the Bill itself. The right hon. Gentleman's first objection was to what he called the administrative provisions. He said that in the past the justices had been able to refuse, and, indeed, had only refused licences on more than one ground, and that they would not be able to do that in future. I join issue entirely with the right hon. Gentleman. What is to prevent justices joining any of the grounds mentioned in the first section?

*MR. ASQUITH was understood to say that they could not consider the question of non-requirement, because Parliament did not enable them to do so.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Oh, yes; indeed they can. That is a matter they are to consider, and if they think the requirements of the neighbourhood will be best met by taking away a licence they can take it away, and the licensee will get compensation. That is the very matter that hitherto the justices have in reality not been able to do, because of the unfairness which they felt they would be inflicting upon the licence-holder. But I think that what the right hon. Gentleman meant was that very often in the past magistrates, not being satisfied with the evidence as to any one ground, had put two grounds together and professed themselves satisfied with the composite ground. That, in my opinion, is a very improper proceeding. Either there is a ground or there is not, and you cannot salve your conscience by saying that there was partly one ground and partly another, and that by adding the two together you obtained one good ground of refusal. The right hon. Gentleman then said that we were taking away from the local magistrates the original jurisdiction and transferring it to quarter sessions. I absolutely deny that proposition. So far from taking away the jurisdiction of the magistrates this Bill actually increases it. Is there any jurisdiction taken away from the magistrates in county boroughs? On the contrary the whole jurisdiction under this Bill is transferred from quarter sessions to the local justices. That will affect 25,000 licences in the country, or one-fourth of the whole. Then there were 33,000 licences which before this Bill were not under any magistrates, but by this Bill the magistrates are given jurisdiction in regard thereto. In the counties there are 20,000 licences, and those added to the 25,000 to which I have referred will make 45,000 out of a total of 99,000 in regard to which the local justices will have far more jurisdiction than they have ever had before. Then take other licences. The right hon. Gentleman says that the power exists in the local magistrates, and that the power is being transferred to quarter sessions. The power never has been with the local justices. They had the power to select particular licences for adjudication, and to adjudicate upon them, but the matter always went to quarter sessions.

MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley): Not always. There was one last year.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: I defy hon. Members opposite to produce a single case in which a licence was taken away and the licensee did not appeal to quarter sessions. Why should a man allow his property to be confiscated or his licence taken away without testing the justices' action by an appeal to quarter sessions? What has happened now? The right hon. Gentleman says the original jurisdiction is given to quarter sessions. No such thing. They have no original jurisdiction whatsoever. The local justices will select the houses and send them up to quarter sessions, they being the body who have to administer the compensation fund, and that is the sole reason why the matter is sent to them. But they have no original jurisdiction; that remains with the magistrates.

*MR. ASQUITH: To do what?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: To select the licences which they think ought to be taken away, and it is only with the licences they select that quarter sessions can deal. I do not call that original jurisdiction. But we have done something more which the right hon. Gentleman entirely overlooked. In these cases of licences refused on the ground of redundancy, with an appeal to quarter sessions, the non-county boroughs with separate commissions of the peace have never had representation. They have been given a representation at quarter sessions which they never had before. Is it a fair description of the Bill, then, to lay down the proposition which the right hon. Gentleman has done that we are now transferring the whole power of the local justices to quarter sessions. A proposition in the opposite direction would be far nearer the truth for never before has so much power been given to the local justices.

Passing from the first clause the right hon. Gentleman referred to the question of compensation. I find some difficulty in following what he really thought ought to be done with regard to compensation. He admitted that there must be some compensation some day or other—I think last year he called it indemnification. [AN HON. MEMBER: No, *solatium.*] Yes, he called it *solatium.* My own view is that the only *solatium* to a publican whose licence is taken away in the public interest is compensation. The right hon. Gentleman said that if there was a licence taken away in the public interests compensation ought to be paid out of public funds, but that the Government had not the courage to do that. I notice that in a later part of his argument he said that the insurance under the Bill was really public funds. I do not agree with his view as to what is the proper way to set up an insurance fund. If the right hon. Gentleman is logical in his argument I do not think he has any reason to quarrel with us or our courage. He went on to say that he based his view upon equity.

*MR. ASQUITH: No; upon expediency.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: I thought the right hon. Gentleman said he preferred equity.

*MR. ASQUITH: No, I rejected the word "equity."

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Then the right hon. Gentleman prefers "expediency," and the proposition is that there is an expediency for doing something for the publican so as not to allow his licence to be taken away from him without an effort being made to give him something in return. There is an expediency in that because, as the right hon. Gentleman says, you cannot possibly expect that any system will be looked upon as a system of justice, even assuming that there was no question of compensation at all, where a number of men having public-houses side by side, under exactly the same conditions, all well behaved and carried on, came up and the magistrate had to make a selection as to which of them he was going to destroy. Nobody could ever pretend that any such system can be considered as a system of justice. Well, what is the question of expediency? I will put it on the ground of expediency. If there is expediency, can there be any fairer or more statesmanlike course than to solve that expediency at the expense of the trade itself? Can you suggest any fairer way than by giving such security as will enable the trade to insure against the non-renewal of licences when the public interest demands that the licence should no longer be granted? But whether you put it upon the ground of expediency or upon any other ground, how much do we gain by chopping words in this way when in reality we come to this compromise—that the trade give up all right to say that they ought to be compensated out of public funds, and are willing that an insurance should be exacted from them to the amount of £1,250,000 a year? In this compromise, upon the one side the allegations which existed even up to last year that compensation ought to come out of public funds is given up, and upon the other side the trade are given the security that an insurance fund is set up against the hardships and the injustices that would be done if a licence were taken away in the public interest.

The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that the proper solution of this problem would have been to give notice to determine such expectancy as the publican had. I never disputed that at all nor have the Government ever disputed it. We have said over and over again that there were two ways of taking away these licences. There is either the method the Government have adopted of allowing the trade to insure, or the method of giving absolute security over a certain number of years, but the two things cannot be put together, and I would like to know what any member of the Opposition would have said if we had brought in a Bill to provide that for the next fifteen years no publican should have a refusal of the renewal of his licence. What we want, and what is the aim, I think, of every man in the House who considers temperance reform in connection with the suppression of public-houses at all, is to deal with the immediate question and to get rid of as many public-houses in the immediate future as possible. I noticed that the right hon. Gentleman in another portion of his argument said that after the time limit—which it was suggested in Committee should be fourteen years—probably the greater number of redundant houses would have been got rid of.

*MR. ASQUITH: I did not say that. I said that was the assumption of the framers of the Bill.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: The right hon. Gentleman based an argument upon it. Well, what is the good of basing an argument upon an assumption that he does not believe. The right hon. Gentleman's whole argument as to the reason why the time limit would be a proper method of solving the question was mixed up with the insurance fund, because he said that at the end of the time limit there would be a greater value attached to the remaining houses and the redundancy would be a smaller risk. If that is the true foundation of any argument it is a justification of the Bill, because it shows that within a comparatively small period of fourteen or fifteen years—a very short period in the history of a country—we shall really have solved that question of the redundancy of licences. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that at the end of that period the publican who remains will have a better property and greater value in his house. He may have greater value if you frame the scheme in the way the right hon. Gentleman has suggested, but he would have less security for the greater value, and therefore, when he was deprived of it he would have the greater hardship, and I cannot see what solution that would be to tell a man that at the end of fifteen years he will have greater value in his house, but it is quite true that that value can be put an end to at the mere *ipse dixit* of the magistrates. The truth of the matter is that no alternative has been suggested to the scheme of the Government which will hold water. [Cries of "Oh."] Nobody has attempted in Committee to bring in the time limit, which the right hon. Gentleman suggests. If they had I have always said it was worthy of consideration whether you should not carry out your scheme of getting rid of these redundant licences without an insurance, and in that way give compensation to the individual, but you can never run the two systems together. A time limit gives no compensation unless you give security for that time, and if a man is insuring at his own expense you are not giving him security, but he is paying for it out of his own pocket. That seems to me to be almost the whole of the argument of the right hon. Gentleman.

For my own part, I have never suggested that the cutting down of the number of public-houses was any very great step in temperance reform, but many hon. Members on both sides of the House think it is. If it is, then this Bill is a great advance in the direction of temperance reform. I should like any Member of this House to read as I read this morning once more the description of the 1869 beerhouses given by the hon. Member for Spen Valley. I should like them to read petition after petition presented to this House asking Parliament to do something to enable the justices to take these houses under their jurisdiction, with a view either to their suppression or improvement. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley, who knows this subject perhaps better than any Member in the House, made an eloquent speech pointing out that it would be a real advance in temperance reform if we could get rid of the evils of the 1869 beerhouses, which constitute one-third of the whole of the existing licences in this country. If all that is true, have we not made a great advance in what the right hon. Gentleman has admitted to be a burning question? Again, what has been happening all these years past since this question of the suppression of public-houses has become more or less a burning one? Notwithstanding the difficulties of getting rid of these houses, no Government has hitherto attempted to put new licences on a different basis which would prevent the very difficulty increasing with which we are met when we come to solve that question. I think it is something that hon. Members on both sides of the House do accord to our proposal for a change in the system of granting licences some meed of praise as doing something to make a fresh start in order that we may not be met with the difficulty in the future.

The right hon. Gentleman opposite said that as regarded new licences the objection would be that the Bill would exaggerate the invidious contrast with the old licences. We cannot help that. We must make a start some time, and make it without any fears, invidious comparisons or anything else, and having solely in our eye the interests of the public which are entrusted to our charge. The right hon. Gentleman also made one other observation, and it is the only one with which I should like to deal for a moment. He said that one of his objections to this Bill was that it placed obstacles in the way of remedial legislation. I have heard that more than once in the course of these debates. It will certainly place no obstacles in the way of new legislation, if that new legislation is just. Hon. Members may say there is an obstacle because we have admitted the principle that these licences ought not to be taken away, or the renewal refused, unless compensation is paid. If that is the obstacle, I am glad we should place that obstacle in the way, because I think it is founded on the most elementary principles of justice. If you want to do injustice—and that is really what the proposition comes to— you can do injustice if you can get the country to endorse your intention. If the only obstacle we have placed in the way of new legislation is the one I have suggested, I think we may rest satisfied that in doing justice to a trade which perhaps, more than any other trade in this country, has been legislated against, we are doing that which will not only enable them to feel that they have been dealt with fairly by this House, but will enable the justices, at the same time to carry out those high duties in the interests of the public which we all know they desire to carry out and which we believe this Bill will facilitate.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said they all acknowledged the uniform courtesy and consideration the Solicitor-General had given during the discussions on the Bill to those who differed from him. He ventured to say, however, that the speech which the hon. and learned Gentleman had now delivered in his official position would arouse deep dissent and dissatisfaction on the Opposition side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had expressed doubts, as the Prime Minister had done, as to whether a reduction in the number of public-houses would necessarily result in a great diminution of drunkenness. He also said that this Bill, which would deal with the question promptly, did not create any obstacle to further legislation regarding the evils which existed in connection with the liquor traffic. The speech of the hon. and learned Member, like many others from the Government side of the House, and some from his side, seemed to deal only with the interests of those who were engaged in this traffic. Hon. Members talked of wishing to do justice to the trade. What ought to be present to the mind of every Member of Parliament in giving his vote was not so much what was just or unjust to those engaged in the trade, but what was urgently wanted in view of the visible condition of the people. It was a singular coincidence that on that very morning when the House had to come to a vote on this vitally important issue there had been distributed the Report of the Committee on the Physical Degeneration of the People. One of the most striking paragraphs in the Report was the following—

> "Next to the urbanisation of the people and intimately associated with it, as the outcome of many of the conditions it creates, the question of 'drink' occupies a prominent place among the causes of degeneration. The close connection between a craving for drink and bad housing, bad feeding, a polluted and depressing atmosphere, long hours of work in overheated and often ill-ventilated rooms, only relieved by the excitements of town life, is too self-evident to need demonstration, nor unfortunately is the extent of the evil more open to dispute."

He wished these words had been rung into the ears of the Prime Minister at an earlier stage of this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had talked of the drunkenness of the people as their own fault, and not the fault of the circumstances by which they were surrounded. The magistrates by their past conduct, and many of the great landlords of the country, were responsible for the presence of the innumerable sources of temptation in the midst of the people. Was it not the plain and obvious duty of Parliament before considering even the question of justice—he was as fond of justice as most men—to place in the forefront the question what they ought to do to check and limit the temptations in our great towns which, as they all knew, worked the ruin of many people in this country? Some of the hon. Members opposite who had spoken in the debates on this Bill had referred only to the interest of those who had invested their money in this traffic. It seemed to him if they would think of the poor wretches, the gin-and-beer-soaked, greasy, ragged wrecks of manhood and womanhood around every public-house, and of the pale, half-starved children who were the victims of this trade, they would take another view of this question from that merely of justice or injustice to those who had realised a gigantic profit generation after generation out of the miseries and the degradations of the poor. He said frankly that he detested the Bill, which, he believed, would not lessen the great sources of moral and physical mischief to which those connected with the trade had consecrated and devoted their wealth to the fatal work of debasing their fellow-citizens. That might seem a strong expression, but let hon. Members consider how the great beer interest had been organised during the past few years, and the way in which they had endeavoured to extend the trade in every possible way. He did say he was right in using strong expressions in the face of these facts.

They were asked by the Bill to consecrate the trade as a vested right, and to give it a permanent endowment representing £300,000,000, which by the provisions of the Bill would be increased year by year. They knew perfectly well that the compensation fund was absolutely insufficient. The machinery of the Bill was directed not to the mitigation of the great national curse of intemperance but to the putting of handcuffs and fetters on the only means of national emancipation. He denounced the Bill as a conspiracy against the national life. It did not contribute anything to the national health, vigour, mental and manual skill, in the great combats of industrial competition. It would not increase the national wealth. It was estimated that one-sixth of the wages of the working classes was thrown away on beer and gin. Even half of that money would be sufficient to transform England into a sort of garden city from end to end. He doubted whether this Bill would have the effect of reducing the number of licensed houses. It seemed to him to offer little or no inducement for the refusal of renewals on anything like an adequate scale, and they would go on increasing in value year by year until that increase formed a prohibitory barrier against reduction. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Ripon Division, in referring to Clause 4, had stated that it would tend rather to the multiplication of new licences and that it would be a source of temptation to obtain relief of local taxation from the proceedt of these licences. He thought very great weight ought to be attached to thas observation, because the Government had refused in any way to put the funds provided by the high licences into a national fund. The devoting of these high licence charges to a fund for local purposes constituted a genuine danger. The principle of high licence, beneficial as it was for intercepting the monopoly value, had the grave danger that it might multiply facilities for physical and moral debasement. It had been said that the Bill might diminish the chances for improvement which were associated with the trust public-house system. He did not look to Lord Grey's scheme as a solution, but accepted the trust system only as an alternative less undesirable than the private profit system. The effect of Clause 4 might be that that form of mitigating the drink evil might be discouraged and under the influence of these motives the whole of the new licences might be placed more at the mercy of the brewers than they had been before.

The Bill was bad from the results which had obviously flow from its operation. It was also bad in respect of the source from which it came. They knew perfectly well the origin of the Bill. They knew where this Bill came from. In substance it came from the board-rooms of the great brewing companies. They had dictated the silencing of discussion in the House. They held the Government in their hands, and said to the Government, "We must have our way, or you will suffer for it." The brewers and distillers were the last friends of this decrepit Ministry, which had stripped itself of every principle, and which had been stripped by the country at the by-elections of every vestige of national mandate or approval. The trade held the fate of the Government in their hands and had thrust their proposals down the throats of a discredited Ministry. He and his friends had listened with much satisfaction to the speeches from the other side of the House inviting the Government, at the last hour, to place a time limit or some restriction on the principle of compensation. They all knew—it was admitted by the Solicitor-General himself—that there was not the shadow of a claim, either legal or equitable, for compensation. The licence-holder and the trader had known it all along. They knew what would be the decision in the Farnham case. It was plain from that decision that it was not only the right but the duty of the local justices to frame a scheme dealing with the whole of the circumstances of the district and to fearlessly reduce the licences to what, in their opinion, was the right measure that should be provided for the district under their supervision. He had always been opposed, in the strongest way, to the principle of compensation. It seemed to him that there could be no right of compensation for a licence granted not for the benefit of an individual, or a class, or a trade, but in the supposed interests of and on the supposed demands and requirements of the people themselves. That was a point which had been absolutely forgotten by many hon. Members in the course of the debates. Any form of compensation whatever, except in the very limited form suggested in the Report of the Peel Commission, was wholly inadmissible. In the words of the Leader of the Opposition that was obviously the only form of compensation that could conceivably be given. He had always said that even that was, on principle, undesirable and improper. The thing would take care of itself by a limited form of insurance under which the licence-holder would get all that he could legitimately look for, but the trade would not have that.

They had been assured, again and again, that this money was the money of the trade. That he utterly traversed. This vast misbegotten and absolutely unsound mountain of wealth which had grown up in the absence of sound legislation and administration, was not theirs to play with at their pleasure. Under the fiction of this law it was meant to give them for the first time the right to use this money, which they now considered was their own property, and to deal with it in their own way, and to use it for mutual insurance to mitigate any losses which they might incur by being deprived of their licences. But this was a national asset. It was open to national taxation at any time, and one of the most obvious evils of the Bill was that there was an attempt to withdraw from the control of the proper financial authorities, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, the collection of this money which was national money, and to which the country was entitled to look for the relief of taxation. By transferring the power from the local magistrates to the quarter sessions it was meant to strengthen the position of the trade by setting up bogus claims which he sincerely hoped would be taken from them by a courageous and honest Treasury and converted into a proper relief for the taxpayers who were now groaning under burdens of taxation for the sake of the privileged classes. He felt very strongly about this Bill. He did not know that there was a single Bill ever introduced in the House of Commons in his nineteen years experience which had excited such a profound feeling of indignation in the constituency which he represented, and he had felt it his duty to enter his emphatic protest against the policy of the Bill, and to express his determination to do his utmost to defeat not only the policy but the whole provisions of the measure.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said he did not want to travel over the whole ground in connection with this Bill, but there were two or three points in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife to which he would like to refer. The true purport of this Bill was to provide a fair and just method by which they could get rid of a large number of redundant public-houses which existed at the present time. That was, he submitted, a true principle of temperance reform. No one could suppose that by one measure they could bring about all that they desired as regarded temperance reform, but no student of this question who desired an improvement in our social laws relating to the drink question would deny that the first and necessary element of a real advance was the diminution of the number of redundant public-houses. The purport of this Bill was to make that possible, which could not be done at the present time. It had been pointed out more than once, though the argument had never been answered, that this Bill, for the first time, enabled the magistrates to deal with what he called the plague-spot of the present licensing system—viz., the beerhouses under the Act of 1869. That was a most important question in every country district and was the main obstacle to securing a real system of reduction of public-houses, especially in the northern country towns. These beerhouses in Manchester were a crying evil. There were 2,000 of them which could not be touched at the present moment. If any Member opposite was really sincere in his desire for temperance reform, he must admit that no such reform could be carried out on a satisfactory basis until these 1869 beerhouses were attacked. That, in itself, he thought, would justify this measure. There were 33,000 of these beerhouse licences in England, or a third of the whole number, and therefore, to bring them under the scope of the Bill was a very large and just measure of temperance reform—although it could not be done without compensation. That would enable the licensing magistrates, under the powers in the Bill, to deal with the worst plague-spot—as regarded drunkenness—in the country.

His second point was—he was not for a moment taking the county boroughs into account—that the great difficulty in regard to the due reduction of the number of public-houses was that the power of the magistrates, in the petty sessional divisions, was exercised on a too small area. Now, any one who had considered and worked the existing licensing system practically had no other feeling than that in order to bring about a proper system of temperance reform in regard to public-houses, there must be a large area. By this Bill they were increasing the jurisdiction of the local magistrates, giving increased powers to every small borough which had jurisdiction at the present time, and bringing into the purview of the magistrates the ante-1869 beerhouses, which, hitherto, whatever abuses attached to them, could defy the law.

A more important point in the Bill was in regard to the compensation provisions. The absence of any fair and just proposal for compensation did, in fact, stand in the way of the magistrates taking any measures of temperance reform as regarded the reduction of public-houses where they were redundant. He did not care on what ground that disinclination to reduce public-houses was based—whether on the moral sense of the country or on the question of expectation on the part of the licensees that their licences would be renewed. Whatever the basis might be, there was that feeling that they could not take away a large number of these redundant public-houses without giving a just measure of compensation to the owners and the existing licence-holders. That was expressed, as a matter of fact, in what was going on. Except in county boroughs the advocates of temperance reform never could get the number of these redundant houses reduced. Occasionally a spasmodic effort was made but it always roused friction. If the country was taken all over, the conditions, as they stood, were an absolute bar to any substantial reduction in the number of public-houses. What were the compensation proposals under the Bill? They had been, he would not say misrepresented, but misunderstood, throughout the whole course of the debates on the Second Reading, in Committee, and on the Report stage. To begin with, the fund, as they knew, was an insurance fund derived from the trade itself. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman for East Fife that there was all the distinction in the world between a compensation fund derived from public money in the ordinary sense, and that contributed by the trade. He thought that anyone who in that House had proposed to raise the compensation fund direct from the National Exchequer would not have been listened to for a moment [OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear!"], and the person who would have denounced it most of all would have been the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife. He had held, for the last twenty years, that the proper way in which to deal with compensation was on the insurance principle, and not by direct contribution from public funds. The measure of compensation in the Bill was not the trade loss which the licensee might suffer. It was not as if it were a compensation case in which the public-houses were taken for public purposes. It was compensation on a limited scale, being only the difference in value of the house licensed and unlicensed, just as if the Act had not been passed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife talked about enhancement. Nothing of that kind was contemplated under the Bill. The Bill would not compensate the owner of the premises as though he had a permanency or a freehold. It would only compensate him on the basis that the enjoyment of his tenure would be narrowed. He challenged any hon. Member to suggest a more moderate measure, or a measure that would give a less amount of compensation to the person injured than would be given under the Bill. Not only that, but there was a special provision which protected the position of the licensee. Under the existing law, if the licensee were only a manager, he would not get any compensation at all; but under the Bill the licensee would receive compensation even though he were only a manager. That was just; and to his mind, if there was to be compensation at all, it could not be put on a narrower or more concentrated basis.

With reference to the time limit, the right hon. Gentleman seemed to misunderstand the principle of compensation as attached to the time limit. He said "there was an expectancy." But all property was expectancy more or less secure; and, according as it was more or less secure, it was more or less valuable. The right hon. Gentleman said that the time limit would destroy that expectancy. Of course, if all property were thrown into a hotch-potch in ten years, in that sense the expectancy would be limited to the ten years. But having regard to justice and fairness, why should the expectancy here be more limited than it was at the present time? That would be the effect of a time limit. At present, the expectancy was more or less secure according to the conditions. All they asked was that compensation should be assessed on the basis of expectancy. In some cases the expectancy would be worth a large sum, because it was good; and, in other cases, it would be worth only a small sum, because it was bad. What would be the result of a time limit? A man who had a poor and badly conducted house would be given a larger amount of compensation than he would be justly entitled to; and where a man received more than he was entitled to that was confiscation, just as it would be confiscation if he received less than he was entitled to. Again, a man in an admirably conducted house, which the magistrates for some reason or other desired to remove, would be given less under a time limit than he would be naturally and properly entitled to if the real basis of his claim were considered. Therefore, a time limit would result in too much compensation in some cases and too little in others. The only true principle was to take the property as it stood, giving less to property which was insecure and more to property which was secure. There was really no other basis of compensation.

There was one other aspect of the time limit which was very much disregarded by hon. Members opposite. Under the Bill, it was desirable to get as large a fund as possible in order to reduce, as quickly as possible, the number of redundant public-houses. Under the Bill there would be ample funds to reduce the number of public-houses to the number mentioned in Lord Peel's Report. What hon. Members would not appreciate was that the houses it was desired to suppress were houses in which a small measure of compensation would be sufficient. In his own district they wished to get rid of the ante-1869 beerhouses; and they found that the compensation was almost nominal in amount, because the value of the houses was little more than if they had not been licensed. Therefore, without a time limit, the Bill would be able to bring about even the measure of reduction mentioned in Lord Peel's Report. But if a time limit were introduced, the fund would be immediately diminished and crippled, although, from the temperance point of view, it ought to be as large as possible. He had never seen any answer to that argument. The truth was that so many hon. Members disliked the idea of any compensation at all that their minds were entirely on the compensation question; and they did not see that the more they got out of the trade under the head of an insurance fund, the greater would be the fund for the reduction of redundant public-houses. Why, therefore, should they, under the guise of a time limit, reduce the fund on which temperance reform in the future would mainly depend? As regarded new licences, the provision was an important but minor part of the Bill. The main principle of the measure was the reduction of the number of redundant public-houses; and that would not be possible without having a compensation fund on a fair basis. On these grounds, he was a very strong supporter of the Bill. He believed that under it they would get justice and that reduction in the number of public-houses without which they could not have any satisfactory system of temperance reform.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said that the hon. and learned Gentleman had contributed a very clear and valuable speech to the discussion with reference to the time limit. The hon. Gentleman supported the Bill because it would lead to a reduction in the number of redundant public-houses. They, on that side, were in entire accord with that object. He did not, however, follow the hon. Gentleman when he said that a time limit would reduce the compensation fund. The view on that side was that the contributions should continue during the period of the time limit; and that, at the end of it, the magistrates should have an absolutely free hand.

Mr. CRIPPS said that if the fund were capitalised for fifteen years instead of for perpetuity the hon. Gentleman would see the difference.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH said his idea was that the fund should cease at the end of fifteen years. The hon. Gentleman referred to the county areas as being too small, and he, therefore, thought the quarter sessions would deal better with the matter. That was not his experience. Every village was a separate entity for this purpose; and quarter sessions would not know the needs of a village fifteen or twenty miles distant. His contention was that every village should be looked at separately, in order to ascertain whether the facilities were sufficient or in excess of the requirements. What would happen under this Bill was that where a licence was taken away partly owing to improper conduct on the part of the holder, and partly because the house was not wanted, full compensation would be given. The Solicitor-General had tried to assure the House that the licensing justices' powers were augmented under this Bill. Speaking generally, in the last twenty-one years the total number of licences refused on the ground of non-requirement had been 1,540. In each case there was a right of appeal to quarter sessions, but in 1,131 of the 1,540 no appeal was lodged. That was to say, that in 1,131 cases the applicants were satisfied with the decision of the licensing justices and did not appeal against it. Therefore, in 80 per cent. of the cases of non-renewal the last word lay with the licensing justices. In future, in similar cases, where under the old condition of things there would have been no appeal, the licensing justices would not be able to decide the matter at all; they would not have a word to say upon it except to report. Was it not quite clear that the work done by the justices in the past without an appeal could not be done in the future?

With regard to the ante-1869 licences, he might say that one of the most urgent reasons for temperance reform was to deal with these licences, which could not be taken away on the ground of non-requirement. It would be convenient to remember what had happened with regard to those licences since 1869. In that year there were 49,000 odd licences of that description, now there were 27,000. They had been reduced by almost half, which was perfectly satisfactory. The real blot on this Bill was that it did not provide an adequate sum for compensation for the licences to be taken away. His own view was that the levy ought to be made proportionate to the demand upon it. If a licence was not required it should be taken away and the demand upon the remaining licences should provide proper compensation. That was not done in this Bill. Under this Bill there was no compulsory levy at all. Then under Clause 7, Sub-section 3, the City of London was set apart as a separate entity, which meant that a contribution of £25,000 annually was put down outside the London area. It was a very curious thing that there should be a separate rule for London. It was as well for the Liberal Party to remember that, so far as the time limit was concerned, they had the Bishops with them and, therefore, they might hope that in another place something might be done to put the Bill on a proper footing.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife had pointed out that this was the handiwork of the Government. That was true to an extent, but the genesis of the Bill was very well known. The beginning of this Bill—and it was a temperance measure—was started at a meeting of the Leicester Licensed Victuallers' Society in June last, when the chairman of the society said—

> "No one appreciated temperance more than the trade."

which he could quite understand, because, they lived out of it. The secretary went further and stated that the Parliamentary Committee of the retail trade took the final step to bring about the Bill, and that the Bill was the result of a meeting of the Parliamentary Committee with a Committee of the Government.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): There is not a shadow of foundation for that statement.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH was sorry to hear the right hon. Member's contradiction, because he feared that he had been giving away the trade too much. He could not discard the statement of a gentleman occupying the responsible position of a secretary so easily, and it would be interesting to know who the Government representatives were on this Committee, and who it was that discussed it with the Government, and how the Government held out, as it always did, and finally, being a weak Government, gave way in the end. They had tried to find out where the compensation was going—it was not clear now as to where it was to go. Most of it no doubt would go to the brewers, and those who actually held the licences would get very little. When making his final protest against the Bill he could only say that he believed it was a bad Bill, but remembering the sources from which it came he believed it was the final act of compensation on the part of the Government. They had compensated all sections of their supporters, and therefore he assumed they had completed the work they had come into power to do. He voted against the Bill in the hope that, as it was the completion of the work of the Government, it also meant the completion of the present Parliament.

*SIR JOHN ROLLESTON (Leicester) said the last speaker had referred to an incident which he said had happened in his (Sir John's) constituency; but he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman had formed an erroneous impression of what took place. He (Sir John) could remember, when the text of the Bill was first published, that the secretary of the Licensed Victuallers' Association denounced the Bill in strong terms. He had not adhered to that position, but the fact that he did so at the outset proved, he thought, that there was no collusion between the Government and the publicans.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said what he read was taken from the *Leicester Evening News*.

*MR. JOHN ROLLESTON replied that the report of the proceedings which he read was in another paper. Continuing, he said he could not let this Bill pass through the House without expressing on behalf of those he represented his appreciation of the action of the Government, and especially of the services of the Home Secretary and the Solicitor-General, in having introduced and piloted through a rather tempestuous passage in that House this most useful measure. He had not intervened much in the debate; but he did not suppose there was any Member who had endured more outside on account of the Bill than he had, and his humble exposition of its provisions in answer to protests of his constituents had been both detailed and laborious. He thought it was fair to say that a very large number of petitions which he had presented and resolutions and letters which he had received had been violently hostile to the Bill. Most of them he believed were genuine expressions of opinion. Some were clearly prepared before the introduction of the measure; others were machine-made. Mainly, however, he believed they were genuine expressions of opinion. He could well imagine an unsophisticated Member of Parliament with an easy and an unopposed seat thinking, if he were in his place, that the whole force and power of his constituency would be directed towards unseating him if he dared in face of such representations to lift a finger or utter a sound in defence of this Bill. He had no such fear, nor did he anticipate any such results. An hon. Member became accustomed after many years of diagnosis to feel with some degree of accuracy the pulse of his constituency, and was able to gauge the apparent force which a minority assumed to have behind it when it placed itself in opposition to any great Bill or measure, and he also learned to appreciate the real power and the quiet strength of that great body of people, the majority of whom were never heard or seen in these controversies. It was this great class who would give this great measure dispassionate consideration and would apply to it a logical mind, and who would prefer to seek out for themselves and follow the interests of justice and truth rather than the noisy battle cries of political Parties.

It was this great class, he felt, who would support the action of the Government in this matter, who would recognise the measure as one of justice and progress and as calculated to remove one of the greatest obstacles in the path of temperance reform. On behalf of those he represented he desired to give it earnest support.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON (Cornwall, Camborne) said he hoped that the hon. Member who had just resumed his seat would not meet with very bitter disappointment on the occasion of the next election, and would not find that the petitioners against this Bill had really experienced the feelings set forth in their petitions. Personally, he could not understand why people who petitioned did so unless they believed in their action.

*Sir JOHN ROLLESTON: A great many of the petitions were printed and machine-made.

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham): They were not legal if they were printed.

*Sir JOHN ROLLESTON: They were sent to me.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Then they ought not to have been presented. Continuing, the hon. Baronet said he was reminded of a very trite saying by Mr. Disraeli in one his novels. He laid down as a political watchword the fact that it was the duty of politicians to provide for the social welfare of the people. If this Bill did provide for the social welfare of the people it was a good Bill, if it did not—and in his opinion it failed to do so—then it was a bad Bill. Throughout the long discussions which had taken place upon it one satisfactory element had been notable and that was the admissions as to the great evil of drinking that went on in this country. The Royal Commission appointed by the Government had admitted that to be a gigantic evil which no effort should be spared to endeavour to eradicate. The Government tried to deal with the evil in their Bill of 1902, and they did something to restrict the sale of drink, but still that Bill did not go far enough. This measure was spoken of as a great measure of temperance reform, and it was very curious that a measure of temperance reform should fail to ensure the support of temperance reformers. He did not believe there was a single Bishop in the country who supported this Bill as it stood; there was hardly a clergyman who did so. He had seen letters in the Press trying to make out that the clergy were in favour of the measure, but he did not think they were quite so bad as that. He did not believe, also, that there was a magistrate in the country who supported the Bill as it stood. They would not oppose it, but they did not think it was what it ought to be in many material respects. And, finally, he might say that, in his opinion, there was not one person among the great body of temperance reformers, who had spent their lives in trying to grapple with the evil, who could honestly support the Bill. It seemed to him that compensation was the be all and end all of the Bill. The head and front of the offending of the measure was contained in the first two or three lines which set forth that licences ought not to be taken away without compensation. That was the spirit of the Bill, and that single fact condemned it most entirely in his opinion.

The hon. Member for Stretford had explained that the Bill would allow the trade to insure. What on earth prevented the members of the trade insuring at the present time in the same way as any other trade or business was insured. He would like to read a short extract from the *Spectator* which was not an extreme or extravagant paper, but was the very essence of respectability. It said—

> "Another curious perversity of view exhibited by Mr. Balfour is to be found in his assertion that the compensation is not to be given out of public funds, but is to be provided by the trade. That is, of course, a pure paradox. The State has hitherto given the publican free or almost free a valuable property. Under the Bill it is stipulated that a small portion of this annual gift shall be returned to the State. But this does not make the compensation fund a private affair of the trade. The Bill merely takes partial possession of a great national asset which has hitherto been wasted. It is not the trade which provides the compensation fund but the State, which has created the value attaching to licences owing to its system of monopoly. The money goes into the public Treasury and is public money like all other money collected by law. Its quality cannot be altered by calling it a

fund provided by the trade any more than the money paid out of A's waistcoat pocket differs from the money paid out of A's trouser's pocket."

That was the doctrine he had preached for many years past. It was not right to talk of this being the money of the trade—it was public money and that fact would not be altered. The money was being paid in order to give a *locus standi* and permanency to the public-house. The Bill in fact was intended to establish for ever the public-houses of this country, and it was being done not by the trade but with public money. The hon. Member for Bolton had described the public-house as a necessary adjunct to civilisation. He had declared that it was a great social need in our life. When he (Sir Wilfrid) heard that he was reminded of the expression used at a great banquet at which lots of champagne was served. A visitor put down his champagne glass and said, "I do love civilisation." He had another quotation he would like to read, and that was from *The Times*—he was in fact quoting now from all respectable papers. *The Times* said years ago that the public-house was a huge misery and nuisance that degraded, ruined, and brutalised a large portion of our population, yet here they had a Bill to establish an institution which did all those things. It seemed to him that there never was a worse object underlying any Bill. He had listened to all the debates on the measure as to the arrangements for magistrates, etc., but that was all leather and prunella—compensation for the publican was the real essence of the Bill, and that was why he was opposed to it.

There were only three courses that could be taken by the State with regard to the liquor traffic. The first was free trade. There might be supporters of that policy, but he had never met them. The second was prohibition of the sale of liquor—a course which, when given a fair trial, had never failed to stop drinking. It was a most extraordinary theory that you could prevent people becoming intoxicated by supplying them with intoxicating liquor. The only way was to stop the supply. The third course was that of regulating the traffic. That had been tried for 400 years, and it had always failed, and this "great temperance measure" would doubtless share the same fate. What the people had demanded was not fresh rules and regulations, but the power to keep the nuisance out of their own district if they thought fit. Temperance reformers had demanded nothing outrageous; they did not want to interfere with the magistrates, but surely if the people did not want a licence in their locality no bench of magistrates ought to be allowed to thrust a licence upon them. If the power of local option were given, people would be able to live in what were sometimes called "uncontaminated zones." It was most extraordinary that Parliament should be spending night after night in arranging how the people were to have drink. Why could they not be allowed to do without it? Surely English working men were as good as the Kaffirs and Zulus, and yet a liquor law had been passed in South Africa such as was refused in England. There was something amazing and pathetic in the present position. Everywhere throughout the world the people were rising up against the liquor curse. The movement was spreading in all English-speaking countries. In America 30,000,000 of people lived under the system of local option. And yet here in England nothing was being done except to consolidate our shame and to perpetuate our misery.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson.

The Bill was going to another place where it was possible, though not probable, that it would be improved. The Prime Minister thought he had done a great stroke of business in introducing and carrying through the House this measure. Nobody appreciated more than he the superhuman skill, ingenuity, dexterity, ability, and agility of the Prime Minister; they were unequalled in history. The right hon. Gentleman had accomplished an unequalled task in keeping his Party together, which was considered a man's one great duty in politics, but it was doubtful whether, on looking back, he would derive any lasting satisfaction from this legislative achievement by which he had riveted the chains of this curse upon his fellow-countrymen, and introduced Tammany Hall into English politics. If the Liberal Party did not make it their first and foremost duty when they came into office to repeal this wild and wicked legislation all their organisation, declarations, declamation, and demonstration would have been nothing more than a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. The opponents of the Bill could do nothing more; they had resisted its progress as long as they had the power; it would now go to another place where it would doubtless be passed; but he still had confidence that this atrocious measure would arouse temperance reformers, the Liberal Party, and the nation, to the ultimate overthrow of the system which was, to the people of this country, their heaviest burden and their greatest curse.

Mr. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said the Bill had been described as a measure to enable licence-holders to insure themselves, but that was a thing that licence-holders had always been able to do, and, as a matter of fact, one company alone insured £60,000,000 of this class of property, undertaking to insure licensees against all risks beyond their own control. This Bill did something very different, in that it set up a vested interest, and gave Parliamentary recognition to a permanent right in licences which had never before been acknowledged. The Solicitor-General had stated that this trade had been legislated against more than any other. So far from that being the case, it was the one trade which, beyond all others, had been financially favoured by Governments. It had enjoyed the fruit of a public monopoly to such an extent that, when a brewery secured a new licence, it obtained from the public something which it could immediately sell for many thousands of pounds. In the financial relations between the nation and the trade, the trade had been favoured at the expense of the nation, not the nation at the expense of the trade. It had been claimed that for the first time the ante-1869 beerhouses were being brought under control. But under what sort of control? The complaint against these "plague-spots" had not been altogether with regard to their number, but to the absence of control, due to the lack of power on the part of the justices to hold out any threats which would give weight to their instructions. The only threat they would be able to hold out in future would be that, unless they conformed to the instructions given, the licence would be taken away, but that full compensation would be paid. That would mean in many cases an enormous profit to the owner, because not only would he receive compensation, but the remaining houses owned by him would benefit by the increased trade which would accrue to them.

As to the contention of the Solicitor-General that greater powers were being given to the justices, what had they done in the past, and what would they be able to do in the future? Putting aside Birmingham and Liverpool, which had been frequently referred to, what had happened in Manchester? In the year 1903 the justices refused the renewal of forty licences; under this Bill, the total fund at their disposal being only £34,000, they would be able to refuse only seventeen. In Exeter, where the reduction had been thirteen, they would now be able to refuse not more than two, as the compensation fund at their disposal would be only £2,342. In Canterbury, instead of being nine, the reduction would be less than two. In Swansea, the reduction would not exceed five, whereas it had formerly been sixteen. It was sometimes stated that in large areas, where the annual value of the public-houses was low, and the amount of the compensation fund would therefore be small, the capital value would be proportionately light, and that consequently the possible reduction in licences would not be so small as might appear probable at first sight. A few days ago figures were given relating to the last six licences which came under the review of the Inland Revenue authorities for death duty purposes. The smallest values were £3,500 and £3,200. But what was the assessment? One was assessed upon an annual value of £50, and the other upon an annual value of £60. So that even with a very low annual value for assessment purposes, the capital value for compensation under this Bill would not be less than £2,000. So far as the reduction of licences was concerned, in 1903, renewals were refused in 480 cases, and 350 licenses lapsed, making a total reduction of 830 under the existing law.

It might be said that that was an exceptional year, but it should be borne in mind that those who demanded this legislation had put forward their claim, not only on account of the reductions in 1903, but especially because the reductions were likely to be still larger in the future. In the face of these facts how could hon. Members represent this Bill as one to reduce the number of licences? As a matter of fact, it was a Bill to limit the reduction.

It had also been said that the Bill placed a fund of £1,250,000 at the disposal of quarter sessions for compensation purposes. But the Bill did not compel quarter sessions to levy this amount; they might levy the full amount, or a smaller amount, or even make no levy at all. If the Government had really desired that this sum should be devoted to the reduction of licences, they would have made it obligatory upon every Court of quarter sessions to levy the full sum, and that when in any case the whole of the fund was not required for the particular district, the surplus should be transferred to the Board of Inland Revenue, to be used in districts where the fund was found to be insufficient. Throughout the debates there had been an entire absence of any recognition, on the part of the Government, of the magnitude of the evil. In the Report just issued on the degeneration of the population, it was stated that drink was a most potent and deadly agent of physical degeneration, and that the craving was appallingly hereditary in its character. When one turned from the speeches of the Prime Minister to the Report, even of the majority of the Royal Commission, one would think that different trades were under discussion. The Majority Report realised that there were connected with this matter evils of which the Prime Minister appeared from his speeches to be unconscious. It was true that in one of those speeches reference was made to drunkenness, but it was merely that the drunkard might be denounced and scorned. The House ought to hesitate to use terms of blame and scorn to these unfortunate individuals, the extent of whose temptation they were powerless to measure. Politicians would be better engaged in bracing themselves to resist their own temptations, than in casting scorn upon those who yielded to temptations to which they themselves were strangers. He knew of a poor man who spent a whole week of his annual holiday without venturing to cross the threshold of his home, because of the special temptations which awaited him at the time. He wished they could have heard during these debates that the Prime Minister had been able to refrain for a whole week from communicating with those who were endeavouring to tempt him by the promise of their votes or the threats of their withdrawal. The Prime Minister had denounced these poor men who had yielded to temptations, the strength of which he could not measure, but taking the whole history and character of this Bill, it was doubtful whether the right hon. Gentleman's own temptations had been wholly overcome.

MR. WHITTAKER reminded the House that, on the First Reading of the Bill, he pointed out that every man who had invested a penny in the trade had done so with a full knowledge of the law; that during the alleged "reckless attack" upon the trade last year brewery securities on the London Stock Exchange had fallen less than most securities, that the profits of the trade had been exceptionally large upon a very inflated capital, and that men had gone into the trade taking the risk, in order to get a large profit. Those facts constituted a refutation of the Home Secretary's case for the Bill, and not one of them had been disproved. The whole case which the Home Secretary made in introducing the Bill had collapsed, and neither the right hon. Gentleman nor anybody else had made the least attempt to defend it. A Return recently issued to the House showed the whole of that case to be ludicrous to an extreme that would scarcely be credited. According to that return, the number of licences refused renewal at the brewster sessions of 1904 was greater than in any year during the last twenty years, and what did it amount to? Simply that seventy-three on-licences were refused on the ground of non-requirement. That was the reckless attack which this Bill was required to stop! Three of those cases were pending on appeal; and thirty-five never went to quarter sessions at all. That disposed of the Solicitor-General's statement that every case of refusal on the ground of non-requirement went to appeal. But of the remaining thirty-five cases, on appeal twenty-four were allowed, and the refusal confirmed in eleven only. Therefore, in the whole of England and Wales, of the on-licences to which this Bill would have applied, only eleven that dared face an appeal court had been refused renewal. He was now dealing with the necessity for the Bill as a protection against the justices. The insecurity was one per thousand. Those who dared to face an appeal numbered only one in 2,000; and those who lost their licences after appeal were only one in every 7,000 licences. Any impartial man would say that those eleven cases ought to have lost their licences.

That was the whole case for this Bill, and it was ludicrous to pretend that a great trade had been placed in jeopardy, that property had been made insecure, and that they could not get men to invest money in the trade simply on account of those cases. And for this the whole licensing system was to be upset, and Parliament was to be dragooned as it had never been dragooned before, in order that the liquor trade should be entrenched in a stronger position, and the whole of the moral forces of the country were to be flouted and ignored. He might be told that if only eleven cases were affected then it was only a small matter. His objection to the Bill was that it destroyed the power of the magistrates. The Government had been entirely misled in this matter, and there had been too many of those consultations to which his hon. friend had referred. He had read a paragraph stating that the Prime Minister had refused to meet a deputation of magistrates from the city of Manchester with the Lord Mayor at their head, although the right hon. Gentleman represented one of the divisions of Manchester. It looked as if the Government had closed their ears entirely to the voice of the magistrates. To this hour they had had no information as to the probable value of licences. Surely that could be obtained. When the Government fixed this levy, surely they had some idea of the value of licences, and the figures ought to be put before the House. A good many statistics were being put forward privately, which were not being put forward in this House. The Government had been misled by information brought to them privately which they dared not bring under discussion in the House. The value of licences could be magnified enormously by the trade when it suited them. This was nothing more or less than a half-baked Bill. A more abominable, unjust, and cruel suggestion was never made in any Bill, than one of the clauses contained when it was first introduced. It amounted to this, that no tied house tenant would have got a single penny of compensation, while tied house tenants would have had to pay the whole of the levy. He challenged the Home Secretary to deny that. A more unjust proposal than that could not be suggested. But that proposal had been entirely altered and recast now, and it had been recast without discussion. He wished to ask the Home Secretary, did the Government, when they drafted that Bill, know what the result of their proposal would be? Was it their intention that the tied house tenant should get nothing and pay everything? If they did know this, and if that was their intention, then they deliberately made a most unjust proposal. Why did they alter their proposal?

When he was down at the Devonport election he happened to look through the Order Paper, and he found that there were Amendments down by thirty hon. Members to alter that provision, and not a single one of those Amendments came from the Ministerial side of the House. Afterwards the true inwardness of it became known because the publicans came into the Lobby. There was another crack of the trade whip, and the Government altered their proposal at once, when the publicans took the matter up. If it was not the deliberate wish and intention of the Government to make that proposal, how was it that such a clause was put in the Bill? One explanation was that the suggestion came from somebody else. He thought the whole of the Bill came from somebody else. The whole of the compensation was intended for the brewer, and the tenant was to pay the levy. Where did that proposal come from if it did not come from the brewers? If that was not the source, then they put it in without knowing what they were doing, and it showed the incompetency of the Government to deal with the question at all. Either they were hopelessly incompetent, because they put in a proposal which they could not defend or justify, or else they made a most unjust proposal. In either case they were totally unfit to deal with a question like this. They were like children playing with matches in a powder magazine. [AN HON. MEMBER: But they do not blow themselves up.] A Canadian who visited the House recently, upon leaving remarked, "Do you call that a Government? I call it a kindergarten." The clerks to the justices of this country had drawn up a memorial showing how complicated the working of this measure was. There were words in the original Bill which laid down that compensation was to be calculated as if this Act had not passed, and now the compensation was to be calculated as though the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were in force immediately before the passing of the Act. In ten or fifteen years time, when a licence came to be refused, what mortal being could tell what would have been the value of the licence at that time if the law had not been altered? It was a preposterous suggestion, and that was one of the clauses which they had not been allowed to discuss.

Take the case of a non-county borough. The local justices were to recommend the refusal of the renewal of licences. A committee of quarter sessions was to consider that renewal, but whether they could give effect to the refusal would depend upon the amount of money at their disposal. It would largely depend upon the value of the licence the renewal of which had been refused. But they would not have the value of that licence before them, and they could only ascertain the value after they had decided, and therefore how could they say whether the amount would fit in? The committee of quarter sessions would not necessarily fix the amount of the levy, but the whole body of quarter sessions would fix it, and they might not agree with the committee. There was a complicated machinery before the publican received his money, and the question arose as to when he would receive it. It had been said that the money could be obtained by borrowing, but what would be the security? If the security was to be the licences, they would have to be kept in force. The fact was that the situation amounted to this, that all licences of the "on" kind would be put in the same position as the 1869 beerhouses, which everybody declared should be got rid of. They could make no substantial reduction of licences without borrowing, and that reduction would be very dearly bought at the price of the loss of control by the justices. They wanted absolute freedom for the justices to deal with these licences, and that was going to be prevented by borrowing. The Solicitor-General said there had been a great increase of power given to local justices under this Bill. He had great respect for the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, and he wished to pay his tribute to him for the manner in which he had assisted in carrying this Bill through the House; but nevertheless he preferred the opinion of the clerks to the justices upon this subject. What did the clerks to the justices say? It was their declared opinion that if the justices were deprived of the power of refusing the renewal of licences on the ground that they were not required, that would have a most serious effect upon their control over licensed houses. The clerks to the justices were men of experience and knowledge, and that was their opinion. Whatever might be the opinion held on this subject in county boroughs, he knew that in the non-county boroughs of this country there was no public body more disliked than quarter sessions, and there was no body less competent to deal with the question, because they had no knowledge of the wants of the districts which they supervised. Before the Royal Commission plenty of evidence was given as to quarter sessions being the great hindrance to licensing reform, and by this Bill an enormous amount of power was to be put in their hands.

The amount of reduction in the number of licences would be limited to the amount of the levy, so that houses which the local justices would have got rid of would continue in the district against the will of their authorities simply because Parliament would not enable them to provide money enough to buy them up.

Why not give them full powers? This Bill was exacted from the Government by the liquor trade and was applauded and supported by that trade; but it was bewailed and denounced by almost every social and temperance reformer in the country, and by ministers of religion, including bishops and clergy of the Church of England. He contended that where a number of houses belonged to the same owner, and the licences were taken away from some of them, full compensation should not be given in respect of the others, because if it were, the owner would get compensation twice over. This Bill practically was only defended by the liquor trade itself and by chairmen of quarter sessions. There was one basis for the contribution and another for compensation. That made the brewer interested in keeping the value down for contributing purposes and up for compensation. Surely a little commercal instinct would have shown that the basis of both ought to have been the same. Take, for an example, a village where every house belonged to the same owner. Supposing they reduced those houses by one-half, they would double the value of the others. Therefore the owner ought not to be compensated for having the value of his property increased. Take the case of six small public-houses yielding £400 a year gross profit. Suppose half of that went in rent, licence fees, and working expenses, and £200 a year was the net profit. The owner of those six houses would get a net profit of £1,200. Supposing they abolished three of those houses, and the trade was reduced by one-fifth, and the remaining trade went to the other three houses. Assuming that the working expenses would be reduced only by 20 per cent., what would be the result? The net profit of the remaining three houses would be £1,440. That was a distinct case where the total profit to the owners would be increased by reducing the number of licences, and yet he was to be compensated for having his profits increased by 20 per cent. Under the closure they were not allowed to discuss this point. A great deal had been said about these licences being property, and a good deal of confusion of ideas and difficulties had arisen. If he were asked whether a licence was property as against another man he should say "Yes;" but if they asked him if it was property as against the nation he should say "No." Licences were the property of the nation. The nation granted a licence to a privileged person for twelve months, and whilst he held that licence he had the expectation of a renewal, and that was his property as against any other man, but it was not a property as against the original grantor of the licence. The nation had always reserved full power to resume possession of its property in licences, and that was the position which they were really dealing with. This Bill was taking away some of the property of the nation in this respect and handing it over to the trade. If there was any property in a licence as regarded the owner as against the nation, then they had no right to make this levy upon the trade. If this was property as against the nation, then the trade were entitled to be compensated by the nation. It was all very well for the Solicitor-General, as a mere superficial debating point, to say that the trade would pay. That was the contention of the Government.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): What is your contention?

MR. WHITTAKER said his contention was that the trade would pay. What he urged was, that if this were property as against the nation, the proposal that the trade should pay was most inequitable and unjust. Making the trade pay was an admission that this was not property in the ordinary sense. The Solicitor-General had stated that no alternative to the scheme of the Bill had been proposed that would hold water. When that assertion was made one of his friends said that no alternative had been made that would hold beer. He had no objection whatever to compensation from the trade to the trade. He thought it was reasonable and expedient that the loss should be spread over the whole trade, but it was not reasonable to limit the power of the magistrates and tie them up in such a way that they could not deal with the licensing problem in the same way as they had done in the past. If the funds were insufficient they could put a further levy upon beer and spirits. If the Government, in the first instance, had made the levy a national one, they would have got rid of the whole difficulty. The Solicitor-General said that this was a compromise. It was a very curious compromise which gave compensation to the trade and deprived the public of their share.

He wished to say a word or two on the time limit. If they gave a public-house a substantial time limit, an opportunity was given to set up a sinking fund to redeem the capital value of the licence. His point was that the additional value they would give to public-houses which remained after the operation of the compensation fund in reducing the number would be more than would enable them to set up a sinking fund. The additional value which would be given to the house by the reduction in the number of his competitors would more than enable him to set up a sinking fund, and supply the levy to the compensation fund. The position was really this. Say that fourteen years time notice were given, and that at the end of that time they resumed absolute possession of the licence; but they wanted to get rid of some licences in the meantime, and, therefore, they called on the licensees to make a contribution to the fund. The House had been told that at the end of the time the licensee would get nothing if the licence should not be renewed. It should be remembered that during the fourteen years he had what he paid for. He had the security that his licence would not be taken away without compensation, and he had the advantage of the improvement in trade by the removal of competitors. The hon. Member had never been able to reconcile the position of the Government on this matter with the proposal made with regard to new licences. If seven years were sufficient as a maximum to give to new licence-holders to enable them to recoup themselves the cost for alteration of buildings, for fittings, and all that kind of thing, and if, as the Bill provided, the new licensees were to pay a very much larger sum for their licences, why in the world was perpetuity required for the old licences, every one of which that would be abolished had had a long way more than seven years existence. Nobody would imagine that the licences taken away by the reduction process would be recent ones. But they were to have perpetuity in the future, though paying a much smaller sum than the new licences. The whole position seemed to him unreasonable, and he submitted that the new proposal of the Government destroyed the logical consistency of their contention against the time limit. While he was one of those who were willing to consent to some form of compensation, he held that there was no right to perpetuity. There was no legal right in the licence of any kind. There was an expectation, but however they might define it, he maintained that it was something less than a perpetual freehold. The fact that there was a levy on the trade proved that it was something less than a perpetual freehold, and, therefore, he thought that could be met by a time limit. The Bill had never been discussed. The Solicitor-General had said that the details were discussed *ad nauseam*. One important point which had never been discussed was the basis of the amount to be paid for compensation. He defied anybody to give a definition of that phrase. The division of the compensation between owner and tenant, the payment of the levy, and the two schedules were matters that had never been discussed at all. The second schedule was entirely new and not a word of explanation of it had been forthcoming from the Government. This Bill was not a compensation Bill. The object of the Bill was to fetter the action of the magistrates. The hon. Member for Salford, when he described the genesis of the Bill, did not talk of compensation. It was a Bill to deal with benches of prejudiced magistrates.

MR. GROVES (Salford, S.) was understood to say that the action of the magistrates in refusing renewals had reached an acute stage.

MR. WHITTAKER said the acute stage was that eleven licences had been got rid of on the ground that they were not required. They were told that the Bill would bring about a great reduction in the number of licences. It was not brought in in response to any pressure of that kind. The pressure that brought in the Bill was the deputation from the brewers for protection against the benches.

of magistrates. The Government did not believe in reduction. They did not attach any value to it. They did not think any evil resulted from temptation. The Prime Minister poured out the vials of his wrath on criminal self-indulgence. Then why in the world had they any licensing laws at all? Why not let public-houses remain open all night? Why interfere with gambling-hells at all to protect anybody from temptation? He thought another Prime Minister in this House adopted a sounder doctrine and took a higher moral tone when he said it was the duty of the Legislature to make it easy to do right and difficult to do wrong. There were some persons concerned beyond the mere victims of intemperance. There were the wives and children who suffered. Had Parliament no duty towards them? This Bill had been forced through the House indecently and needlessly by a majority which was only held together by the fear of a general election. They knew their fate. They knew what was before them when they went to the country. The split in the Party on the fiscal question placed them at the mercy of the brewers. The brewers saw their opportunity and ever since that occurred, as had been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, they held their office on a servile tenure, and the wages of ignominy was contempt. They were sacrificing the interests of the people to those of a trade, and it would be as disastrous to them as it would be discreditable.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division had quoted a statement which was made by Mr. Gladstone with reference to the duty of the Legislature. He should like to give a quotation from Mr. Gladstone with reference to compensation to publicans. Mr. Gladstone, speaking in the House of Commons in 1880 on Sir Wilfred Lawson's temperance Motion, used these words—

> "I should have been better pleased with it if it had included some reference to the principle of equitable compensation. I want a frank recognition of the principle that we are not to deny to publicans as a class the benefits of equal treatment. Considering the legislative title they have acquired, and the recognition of their position for a long series of years, they ought not to be placed at a disadvantage on account of the particular impression we may entertain as to the mischiefs caused by the licensing system as now carried on."

Mr. WHITTAKER: Quote what he said in 1888.

Mr. PIKE PEASE said an hon. Member who spoke earlier in the debate did not admit that the money which was going to be paid to the insurance fund was coming from the trade. The hon. Member who had just sat down admitted that it did come from the trade. He thought some hon. Members opposite did not realise that many supporters of the Government honestly believed that this measure was a great temperance reform. Many of them had spent a considerable amount of time in dealing with the question of temperance and had very strong feelings in regard to it. One of the greatest evils in connection with drink was the custom of "treating."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

Mr. PIKE PEASE said three or four men would go into a public-house, and perhaps they did not want more than one drink, but they had three or four before coming out. Mr. Gladstone was not the only great figure in the Liberal political arena who had been in favour of compensation. Mr. Bright was also in favour of it. Speaking at Birmingham in 1880 he said—

> "It would be unjust to close these houses without compensation. I could not agree to the proposition. I should say that if the magistrates close public-houses on other grounds then their infringement of the law, as a matter of course fair compensation should be paid to those so dealt with."

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick said the other day that if this Bill were passed it meant good-bye to temperance reform in England. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had hopes that in the future there might be Sunday closing, and other measures which he believed were true temperance reforms. He himself could not see that this Bill, dealing with the question of compensation, was likely to prevent some of those reforms which the right hon. Gentleman thought the nation required. Shortly afterwards the right hon. Gentleman said that on account of the guillotine it would be the duty of the next Liberal Government to put back the clock and alter this measure. Even on his own showing, therefore, if the measure was passed into law there would be a chance of temperance reform. The question of the alteration of the power of the magistrates was of very little importance indeed. It appeared to him that under this measure there would, in the future, be the same power exercised as there had been in the past, the only difference being that the appeal would come from the aggrieved party instead of from the trade. It was stated in a recent letter to *The Times* that the Government were handing over an enormous amount of money to the trade itself, and giving it a vested interest. He was one of those who at first was inclined to go in for a time limit. He thought if the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division would look at a paragraph which appeared in *The Times* the other day on Stocks and Shares, he would see that in the vast majority of instances brewery shares, from 2nd January, 1903, to 19th July, this year, had fallen very remarkably.

MR. WHITTAKER: So have all others.

MR. PIKE PEASE said it was perfectly true that a good many others had fallen, but if the enormous amount were being handed over to the trade that was alleged the shares would have risen. He believed the Bill would do a great deal towards reducing licences, and that the average amount of compensation would not be more than £500. Though hon. Members opposite did not appreciate the measure at the present time he hoped they might be led to do so in years to come.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he wished to take the opportunity while the Prime Minister was in the House to say a few words on the question of temptation, because the impression left on his mind by the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman was that every man who indulged in drink was capable of taking care of himself, and refusing to drink altogether if he were so inclined. He held that there were thousands of our fellow-countrymen and countrywomen who could not resist temptation, and who, when the opportunity was put in their way, were incapable of standing up against it. If everyone had the moral fibre and character of the Prime Minister there would be very little need for a measure of temperance reform at all. Those hon. Members who attended prayers at the opening of the proceedings of the House listened to the words, "Lead us not into temptation." He asked the Prime Minister whether he had thought of the thousands of people in the United Kingdom who were chargeable to the rates because they were in asylums. Were they there because they were capable of looking after themselves? No, it was because temptation was too much for them, and did that not involve an obligation to take temptation out of their way? There was no assurance that by this Bill they would get rid of a single licence. The circumstances under which the measure had been brought in reminded him of one of Æsop's fables. The lion, the fox, and the ass went hunting, and the ass, being asked to divide the spoil, apportioned it in three equal parts. The lion, which was the brewer in this case, was so angry with this distribution that he fell upon the ass and killed him. He then turned to the fox, which was the Government, and asked him to make the division. The fox put the whole in one heap and placed the donkey on the top. "Where," said the lion "did you learn to make such a just division?" "From the fate of my poor friend on the top," replied the fox. The Government had not the moral courage to stand up against the people with whom they had been associated, people who had brought them nothing but disgrace. To introduce a Bill like this and call it a temperance measure was playing it low down with the intelligence of the British public. The speech made by the Solicitor-General to-day was worthy of a better cause. Fancy exercising his great talent to defend a thing like this Bill, which was called a temperance reform measure! The Bill was designed solely in the brewers' interest. Supposing a man with £500 wished to take the "Pig and Lion." The brewer would say the value was £5,000, and would ask the applicant to sign an agreement to pay 5 per cent. on a loan of £4,500. It was true that for assessment purposes the house was valued at only £1,000, and he maintained that that ought to be the value for compensation purposes. But the chances were that the Inland Revenue, in fixing the amount of compensation, would take half the brewer's valuation, or £2,500. In that case what was to prevent the brewer from commencing an action for the recovery of the other half, which was covered by the agreement signed by the tenant? This Bill was almost as delightful a Bill for the lawyer as the Workmen's Compensation Act, under which it was thought, when first introduced, that all that was necessary for a workman to do was to put a penny in the slot to get compensation. A better Bill than this could be framed in any workmen's club. This was a Bill for the endowment of the brewers, and to make the men in the public-houses bigger slaves than ever. It was said that if they had one firm supplying all the houses in the district the beer would be of a better quality. In a free house if the beer supplied by the brewer was flat it was returned; but the man in the tied house dared not send it back. He had to work it off on the public somehow, although the beer was so sharp as to give one the belly-ache to look at it. The public had to suffer in consequence. Really and honestly there were hundreds of houses belonging to brewers which were not worth keeping open, but were run at a positive loss. These houses were used as a confidence trick for taking advantage of a saving man. No matter how bad trade was, the brewers could always get people ready and willing to take these houses. They could always get men who thought that if only they had a licensed house, they would get paradise; but too often, when they did get it, they found it was hell. This Bill did not remove in the slightest degree the temptation of drink from a weak, erring brother or sister's way. He maintained that the time of the House had been wasted on this Bill, when it might have been used to better purpose in doing something for the hundreds of thousands of poor people who were living under conditions of which they should be ashamed. He deeply regretted that Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench had not devoted their abilty and their energy to doing something which would benefit the poor of the country, instead of passing a measure to make the rich brewer richer, and the poor poorer.

Mr. TALBOT (Oxford University) said that the hon. Member who had just sat down had allowed his enthusiasm to run away with him in his arguments about temptation. The hon. Gentleman was associated with those who maintained that this Bill was being passed in the interests of a single trade. That was an assumption which had been audaciously made even by people in high position, and had come to be believed. He had no connection with the brewery trade, nor had his constituents; indeed, the great bulk of them were not on the brewer's side, but on the other side. He deliberately said that this Bill was really the first honest attempt that had ever been made by the House of Commons to move out of the way of the working classes, whom the hon. Gentleman opposite represented in a great measure, a great source of temptation. He insisted that it was the duty of Parliament to remove, as far as it could be done without injustice, any temptation from those who had not the courage to resist it. One of these temptations was the redundancy of public-houses. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had denounced the Bill, but what had his friends ever done to remove this great temptation to drink? This Bill was an honest attempt to diminish the number of public-houses, but what alternative proposal had hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite to offer? Whether the Government happened to be at the present moment in high, or low water, he cared not; his contention was that they were doing a great public benefit for the time being. He supported that by the argument of the hon. Member for Spen Valley, who absorbed so much of the time of the House. That hon. Gentleman said that with all their efforts and attacks upon the trade, only seventy licences in the whole of England and Wales had been refused on the ground of non-requirement; and that after appeals had been considered, only eleven licences that dared to face an appeal had been refused. Therefore the hon. Gentleman out of his own mouth admitted that the present system had absolutely failed. The reason why it had failed, and why the discretion of the local justices was to be interfered with, was that these local justices, as a body, had said they would not remove a licence, the removal of which would be an injury to an individual. The hon. Member for Woolwich appeared to think that the magistrates in quarter session, or petty sessions, would not take any advantage of this Bill; but that was an imaginary danger which he was sure would not be realised. He believed that a very determined effort would be made by the magistrates to take full advantage of the powers given them under this Bill. He sympathised with much that had been said as to the unsatisfactory way in which the latter part of the Bill had been considered by the House. The Leader of the Opposition made a sensational remark about its being a farce. They could estimate that remark at its proper valuation. If the Opposition had discussed the Bill in its initial stages in the way in which they had discussed it since the closure was applied, there would have been no closure. Anyone who looked at the Order book would see that the enormous number of irrelevant Amendments put down to the first clauses of the Bill made it clear to the Government that if they wished to deal with this question at all they must deal with it under conditions which he admitted were deplorable. For those deplorable conditions it was the Opposition and not the Government that were responsible.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know that the right hon. Gentleman has made much of a case for the Government in regard to the guillotine. He says these Amendments were all irrelevant. If they were, Mr. Speaker would not have allowed them, and they would not have occupied a moment of the time of the House. It is a poor compliment to the intelligence of the right hon. Gentleman and the Government to suggest that they could not distinguish between the good and pertinent Amendments, which were few, and the iterated Amendments which arise from the fact of the same idea occurring to half-a-dozen Members with reference to the same point and therefore the same Amendment occurring in different places with reference to the same point. The right hon. Gentleman and the Government cannot get over the fact stated by my right hon. friend who moved the rejection of the Bill to-day, that as a result of the manner in which the Government have controlled the discussion—if discussion it can be called—that four-fifths of the Bill have never been discussed at all, either in Committee or on Report, and of the part of the Bill which has not been discussed a half consists of Amendments put into the Bill by the Government which there has never been an opportunity even of being fairly considered by the House. I suppose we are now seeing, I hope we are seeing, for this session the last of this remarkable Bill, but we are not hearing the last of it, for I fear that both in visible and audible form we shall have it put before us again year after year until it has been completely altered from its present shape. It will be like what is supposed to happen in actual life—I cannot say I am much of a believer in that respect—that just as the ghost of some misdoer is supposed to haunt the locality in which his misdeeds were committed, I am afraid this Bill will haunt the House for years to come, until an effort has been made by Parliament, with the approval of the country, to modify the vices which it contains and to develop and extend what modicum of good it may be found to have within itself. The Bill makes the most revolutionary changes in the system of licensing which has prevailed in this country for 300 or 400 years. It affects the procedure in licensing and makes other alterations which must deeply affect the welfare of the community.

The Bill making such revolutionary changes was introduced without any semblance of authority from the country, and persisted in against a great movement of resentment and indignation, which has swelled and increased from week to week as the country realised better the true scope and purpose of the Bill. And, lastly, it has been forced through the House by the suppression of discussion. We inquire very naturally what is this

Bill which has been so introduced and so dragged through the House? The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor-General, to whose speech I listened with admiration and a certain degree of amusement—proper and respectful amusement—and who has earned our thanks and admiration throughout the course of these discussions, not only by the manner in which he has treated the House and conducted the case placed in his hands, but also by the skill and completeness with which he had evidently mastered what must evidently have been to him a new language—the right hon. and learned Gentleman seemed determined to make out a tremendously strong case for the Bill, and he indulged in the process, which is often very effective, of over-trumping your opponent's cards. He took all the cards in which he found we were attacking the Bill, and he claimed for the Bill every possible excellence in respect of these particular points. It was a temperance Bill! [OPPOSITION ironical laughter and MINISTERIAL cheers.] Yes, we have heard over and over again that it was a temperance Bill. It has two objects. One is the reduction of licences, the other was for subsidiary purposes which were of comparatively slight consequence. The real object of this legislation, from beginning to end, was the reduction of licences! Compensation was not the essence of the Bill, according to the right hon. and learned Gentleman. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said that another way of dealing with the difficulty would be by fixing a certain time during which the licensee would not be disturbed. There might be, said the right hon. and learned Gentleman, a good deal to be said for that. But the main thing he dwelt upon was that that could not be combined in this Bill, which was a Bill of compensation. A time limit by itself, compensation by itself, or insurance by itself might, according to the right hon. and learned Gentleman, be arguable and defensible methods of dealing with the difficulty, but not all in this Bill. This is a Bill which, according to the right hon. and learned Gentleman's view, is for the reduction of licences, and it was introduced because, in the opinion of the brewers and the Prime Minister, the licences were being reduced faster than necessary. We cannot forget that. Why does the right hon. Gentleman condescend to speak to us in this way? We cannot forget the deputation that came to the Prime Minister last year. We cannot forget what they said to him and what he said to them—the pledges with which he met their demands in redemption of which this Bill has been introduced. We remember the speech of the hon. Member for South Derbyshire at the dinner of the Manchester and Salford Licenced Victuallers' Association, in which he congratulated the trade on being

> "In a better position to fight their cause than ever before, for they had recently gained a most important ally to their cause. They would remember the deputation which waited on the Prime Minister during the last session of Parliament to put the case for compensation before him, and the response of the Prime Minister was in every respect satisfactory, and that the Government of the day were pledged up to the hilt to deal with their case in the coming session."

[MINISTERIAL cheers.] Hon. Members opposite endorse that view. I am glad to have them on my side, because I was saying that that was the origin of the Bill, and all the talk about this being a temperance Bill and a Bill for the reduction of licences is an afterthought brought in to cover the original and underlying and essential intentions of the Bill. If the intention and purpose of the Government was really to reduce licences, why did not they set about it in a more direct way? Why did not they lay down a rule by statute prescribing the number of licences that must not be exceeded in different classes of the community? Why did not they bring the licensing authority into closer touch with the people concerned, and give the people a more direct voice even than they have at present in settling a matter so vitally concerning their comfort and wellbeing, instead of removing the licensing authority further and further away from the influence of local opinion? If they had done that, we should have viewed in a very different spirit anything they proposed by way of easing the process by a system of insurance. That is what I said in my election address, which has been quoted to-day. I never advocated anything like this measure. I said—

> "Let us reduce licences; let us have a general system of compensatory reduction hroughout the country."

What I recommended was the main lines of the Minority Report of Lord Peel's Commission. If that implies a favourable view of the Government measure, I would ask is that the opinion of Lord Peel, or of the member for Spen Valley, or any other Member of that minority? The Solicitor-General, not content with showing to his own satisfaction that this was a temperance Bill for the reduction of licences, devoted himself to proving that it was also a Bill for extending and increasing the powers of the local magistrates. He takes the bull by the horns. The Prime Minister associates the claim of the brewers with the principles of eternal justice. But by whom is this Bill demanded? Is it demanded by any of the great bodies who are likely to have an authoritative voice on the subject—by the licensing authorities, temperance workers, or the local councils? I have not heard a single bench of magistrates or of any local authority or temperance society petitioning for this Bill. As far as I have seen the latest returns, petitions against it have been signed by 380,462 signatures, and for it there have been two petitions with 285 signatures. But there have been on the other side strongly-worded remonstrances and trenchant criticisms from magistrates, and an unbroken volume of dissent from all people who are keenly interested in the cause of temperance. Reference has been made to the fact that the Prime Minister, who had a memorable interview with the brewers, has actually declined to receive a deputation representing the Manchester magistrates. He sees the brewers and invokes eternal justice on their behalf, but the magistrates are beyond the pale; the magistrates have been guilty of rash conduct and have offended against justice by seeking to carry out their plain duty.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: When did this happen?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is a matter which has been published in the newspapers. I do not know when it is supposed to have happened. I read it in the newspapers. Then the right hon. Gentleman has never been asked by the magistrates of Manchester, headed by the Lord Mayor, to receive them on this subject and has never refused?

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not remember it.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am glad to hear it. I withdraw at once that part of my allegation. It did seem to me rather strange.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Was it this year?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: After the Bill was introduced?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes. Then the right hon. Gentleman does not dispute it? I admit that the right hon. Gentleman has so many applications of this kind that he may very well forget at the moment, but it was a significant application to be made to him, and I should have thought that it must have remained in his memory. All the claims put forward for the Bill, that its one object and tendency is to promote temperance, is dust thrown in our eyes which shall prevent us from seeing the truth. The principle of this Bill is the conversion of a year-to-year concession into a perpetual freehold. That is at the root of it. It involves the final alienation of the right of the public to control the liquor trade, to define the conditions under which it is to be exercised. For that statement I appeal to the hon. Member for South Derbyshire, who speaks with great candour. He says that the Bill lays down the great principle that a licensed owner's property is his own. Unfortunately it is not his own property; it is the property of the community. The whole point turns upon that; but it is a refreshing acknowledgment on the part of the principal advocates of the measure that this is the main principle of the Bill. That being the main principle of the Bill, there is no question of our attitude. I found it to be my duty when the Bill was introduced to meet it with a maledictory welcome, and now as it is parting from us I have to say that no compromise which involves that principle can be accepted by us. Sooner or later, and probably soon rather than late, as opportunity may offer, we shall not be content until some strong steps have been taken to remedy the evil that is in the Bill and to modify what we believe to be the injury that it will inflict on the people.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman in his last words uttered a statement with perfect accuracy when he said that he received the Bill on its first introduction with a maledictory address. It is true, but I think that not one of the numerous hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House had the smallest conception of what the nature of the Bill was going to be.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Home Secretary explained it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Having not the smallest conception of what the Bill was going to be, the right hon. Gentleman and his friends came down admirably armed *cap-à-pie* to deal with a Bill framed on entirely different lines. Some, including no doubt the right hon. Gentleman, altered their speeches so as to make them decently applicable to the exposition made of it by the Home Secretary. Others were not so fortunate. But the question to which he has recalled my memory is only useful because it shows that this Bill has been met with prejudice from the first. Through every stage of it hon. Members opposite have been occupied more in finding out what evils it might be supposed to contain than in making any fair acknowledgment of the great merits which, even on their own principles, it can be shown to demonstration to possess. The right hon. Gentleman would have been violating the invariable tradition of every speaker on the other side of the House if he had not dragged in again the old friend the deputation from the trade, not of the brewers, to me last year, and if he had not based upon it, in language which was courteous in form but not complimentary in substance, the accusation that in framing this Bill we were animated solely by the desire of pleasing a particular class at the cost of the public. Wealth in the attribution of motives is a great qualification of some hon. Members opposite, and we have had some most remarkable instances in these debates. There is no principle of this Bill which I have not advocated through the whole of my political life. I have always desired temperance reform. I have always said that a publican dispossessed of his licence through no fault of his own should be compensated. Those are the two principles of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that I was converted to the principle of compensation or *solatium* or consideration—I forget the wealth of alternative epithets suggested by the deputation from the trade. If this Bill is in accordance with the principle which I held before the deputation came to me, why all this talk about it? If these are not merely the views of my constituents, but the traditional principles of the Party to which I belong, why is it suddenly supposed that I should be converted by a nefarious electoral interest in the adoption of a Bill which, after all, only carries into effect the opinions which I have long expressed in public and private? I am not the least ashamed either of having received that deputation or to have said what I did say. I refreshed my memory the other day by reading the speech I made. With every word of it I agree this day, and there is not a single syllable that I see any cause to withdraw. For my own part I shall always think it a proud moment in my life if I am able to do anything for any interest, be it what it may, to preserve it from unjust attack. I do not share the view of hon. Members opposite that the brewer and the publican are outside the pale of ordinary citizenship, that they are to be subjected to principles which you would not think of applying to any other class of the community. The hon. Member for Spen Valley and the hon. Member for Woolwich have taken up a phrase which I let drop in the earlier speeches on the Bill to the effect that in my judgment the principal criminal in connection with the evils of drink was the man who criminally yielded to temptation. Of course I never meant to suggest by that that we should not do what we can to diminish temptation.

Mr. CROOKS: That is better.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Ah! yes; but I venture respectfully to repeat my remarks. I think that a great laxity is introduced into our notions of morality if we habitually transfer the gravamen of the crime from the man who commits it to the man who tempts it. It is not sound, it is bad morality; and I have never withdrawn in the smallest degree from the position I have laid down, which I believe to be fundamentally connected with all that is virile in citizenship and sound in private morality. Of course these are deplorable and criminal cases where the publican in attempting to drive a better trade gives deliberate temptations to a man to drink; but the publican as an individual is not responsible for the mere fact that he has a place where alcohol is sold and some man comes in and buys it. It is not fair to charge him with faults of which he is not guilty, unless you hold the view that liquor is so abominable a thing in itself that the man who has anything to do with it is really exercising an illegitimate trade. It is not our view. The hon. Member for Spen Valley would not try to stop the manufacture or the sale of alcohol. He dare not. As long as the manufacture and the sale are legal, put such restrictions as you can upon it which you think will prevent temptation, but will give the legitimate consumer a fair opportunity of exercising what he has a right to do, and do not attack the morals or the property of a man who is carrying on what you must yourself admit to be a legitimate trade. The perverted moral view to which I have referred is the parent of the fallacy, which crops up again and again through these debates—namely, that nothing can be good for temperance which is not bad for the brewer and the publican, and that everything which is bad for the brewer and the publican must be good for temperance. Hon. Gentleman seem to think that they do the great cause of temperance a service when they are doing something to injure the trade.

Mr. WHITTAKER: Nonsense! Rubbish!

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member interrupts me in a not very civil way, and he will permit me to say that I have listened in absolute patience to at least ten long speeches from him in which he has accused me individually of being the slave of a particular interest. Let him, then, listen to me with patience when I make this very moderate and modest retort. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has perpetrated for the hundredth time the gross fallacy that this Bill creates a freehold. It does not create a freehold. I am sure that if the right hon. Gentleman would give his attention to what that statement involves he will see that it cannot be so, and the mere fact that the interest does not come to an end does not constitute a freehold. You can have a permanent interest which is much less than a freehold. All that this Bill does is to recognise the interest in existing licences until that interest is extinguished by fair compensation. As it is the last time that the general principle of this Bill can be discussed in this House, I will make three observations. Can any Gentleman opposite mention a single Bill which has been passed, either by his own Party or by any other Party, which does provide in a practical fashion, as this Bill does, for the diminution of licences? They cannot. Can they mention a single Bill introduced but not passed which they think would deal more equitably with this situation? At any rate, the name of the Bill is not on the tip of their tongue. [An Hon. Member: Sir William Harcourt's Bill.] Oh, that is the equitable method — local veto without even the compensation which the right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench think ought to be given in the form either of "a solatium" or "a consideration." I ask another question. The freehold tenure of the beerhouses has been in operation now for more than a generation. Can anyone suggest the name of a Bill which would have dealt with these houses, or a Bill which has even tried to deal with them? Can anyone deny that this Bill does deal with them? This Bill provides the funds for dealing both with the beerhouses and with the ordinary licensed houses. We have had extraordinary divisions of opinion on the other side as to who pays for those funds. The Opposition Front Bench thinks they are paid by the public. The hon. Member for Spen Valley thinks they are paid by the licence-holders. That difference runs to the root of all temperance reform, and it is one they will have to reconcile before they set to work to carry out that Amendment of this Bill which they have promised us. It is truly astonishing to find in one speech, as in that of the right hon. Gentleman, first the statement that we have created a perpetual interest with which Parliament would never meddle, and then the statement that the first thing Gentlemen opposite mean to do when they come in is to remodel this Bill. I do not know which to accept, but I rather think both are false. I am sure the power of Parliament is not checked or throttled in the direction of legitimate licensing reform by this Bill; and I am tolerably certain that this Bill will not be fundamentally altered by hon. Gentlemen opposite when the responsibility of dealing with it is thrown upon them.

One more question I will put. Has any measure ever been introduced into Parliament within the recollection of living men or within the recollection of history which endeavoured to put future licences upon a reasonable ground? The same mournful silence as when I asked the other questions! If this Bill does, as is admitted, deal with all the four great problems that I have mentioned, is it not folly to say that it is one that should be resisted as they have resisted it, and one which the true temperance reformer ought to regard as other than a great help in the cause to which he has devoted himself? I am aware that great prejudice exists on this subject, and that the debates in this House, or many of the speeches in those debates, have done everything to increase that prejudice; but I am perfectly convinced that when the Bill is working, and when it is seen that by this Bill, and by this Bill alone, you can without gross injustice and discontent really diminish the number of licences in this country, all parties, forgetting the differences which have unhappily divided us for the last three months, will admit that this is the greatest contribution ever made to the cause of temperance reform.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 217; Noes, 129. (Division List No. 289.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.(Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, John George
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T.(S'thampton)
Chapman, Edward
Clancy, John Joseph
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnC.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cullinan, J.
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Faber, Edmund B.(Hants, W.)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, Rt.Hn.Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F.Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R.(Dulwich)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayden, John Patrick
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Howard, J.(Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy

Randles, John S.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G.E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E.C(S Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
McKenna, Reginald
McLaren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

POST OFFICE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) asked what was the object of the measure.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (LORD STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton) said, as he had previously explained, the object of the Bill was to avoid the present accumulation of poundages in Post Office orders which were not presented within the proper period, and also to make new regulations in reference to embossed stamps. Legislation was necessary; and he had promised to introduce it. The change would be for the benefit of the community generally.

Bill reported, without Amendment.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) asked what privileges would the Bill confer.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said that the graduates of the Liverpool University would obtain the same advantages as were enjoyed by the graduates of other Universities in the United Kingdom.

Bill reported, without Amendment.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

REGISTRATION OF CLUBS (IRELAND) BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to, with an Amendment.

LEEDS UNIVERSITY BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) asked if the Government had any further information in reference to the negotiations with Russia. He also wished to know when there would be a statement in reference to the Bills on the Order Paper, and especially whether the Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill would be taken.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) said he was not in a position to give the House any further information in regard to the subject of negotiations with the Russian Government. With reference to Bills, a statement would be made on Tuesday by the Prime Minister on the subject.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at five minutes before
Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 1st August, 1904.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Finance.
2. Savings Banks Acts Amendment.
3. Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station Order Confirmation.
4. Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation.
5. Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation.
6. Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation.
7. Melrose District Water Order Confirmation.
8. Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh).
9. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers).
10. Thurles Urban District Council.
11. Ebbw Vale Urban District Water.
12. Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad.
13. Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways).
14. Metropolitan District Railway.
15. Lytham Improvement.
16. Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment).

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—County of Suffolk.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered to-morrow.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Great Western Railway Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Railways (Private Sidings) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendment to each Bill agreed to.

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Tottenham Improvement Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to.

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill; Torquay Tramways Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to.

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to, with an Amendment.

Leyton Urban District Council Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^a (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee. (No. 176.)

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; of Methodist Conference; Free Christian Church of Croydon; Executive Council of Manchester Sunday School Union; Teachers and Adult Scholars of Friends' First Day School, Manchester; and New Brompton and District Federated Temperance Council. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for Amendment of; of Inhabitants of Cheltenham; Hampstead Society of Women's Total Abstinence Union; and Persons signing (1). Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY.

Returns of the number of courts-martial held and summary punishments inflicted on seamen of the Royal Navy, etc., during the year 1903.

DRAINAGE OF LOUGH NEAGH AND THE LOWER BANN.

Report on the drainage of Lough Neagh and the Lower Bann, furnished to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland by Frederick J. Dick, M.I.C.E., Engineer to the Commissioners, 31st May, 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

REGISTRATION OF CLUBS (IRELAND) BILL.

Commons Amendment to Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL.

Examiner's Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee To-morrow.

POST OFFICE BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 174.)

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª To-morrow (The Earl of Derby). (No. 175.)

LICENSING BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord BELPER: My Lords, I must at the outset express my regret at having to move the Second Reading of a measure of this great importance at such a late period of the session, and I wish especially to do that because I know that in your Lordships' House there are a considerable number of Members with practical experience of the matters with which this Bill deals, and who take a very deep interest in it. I think it would have been a great advantage if we could have discussed the Bill at a time when we should have had a fuller attendance than is perhaps possible in August. At the same time, I think I can assure your Lordships that there will, at all events, be ample time given for the discussion of the Bill at its different stages, thereby affording your Lordships full opportunity of coming to a deliberate conclusion upon the proposals in the Bill.

I am reminded, in moving the Second Reading of this measure, that this is neither the first nor the second time that I have had the honour of having charge of a measure for licensing reform. Two years ago I had charge of a Bill which made very important amendments in this direction, and that Bill was received with the general, I may say with almost the unanimous, assent of the House. I am under no misapprehension with regard to this Bill. I know that I am not in the same happy position that I was then, and that this Bill, as the Notice Paper shows, will meet with opposition from your Lordships. I know also that this Bill deals with a branch of licensing reform involving most complicated, difficult, and delicate questions, and I do not think it would be possible for any solution of these problems to be brought forward which would meet with the unanimous, or even the general, support of your Lordships or of those outside who take an interest in this question. I hope that in the remarks I have to make in recommending the Bill to your Lordships I may be able to show that there is real need that this question should be dealt with without delay, and that I may be fortunate enough to persuade some of your Lordships that the Government are making a serious effort to settle the question in a fair and equitable manner.

I do not think it necessary to describe the unsatisfactory position of affairs now as regards the manner in which magistrates feel they can use their discretion, and as regards the position of the licence-holders.

We all remember the time when it was the almost unanimous belief of the magistrates that when questions of renewal of licences came up they had no power to refuse renewal on the ground that the licences were redundant and not required. I know, my Lords, it has been said that there were people who knew what the law was even at that time; but I can only say, from my own experience as a licensing magistrate, which I am sure will be borne out by that of other noble Lords, that we were invariably given the advice by those who were competent to advise us that we had no power except to renew the licences unless there were grounds of misconduct or other matters of that kind. The result has been that the great bulk, the enormous majority of the magistrates have invariably acted in that belief. Not only so, but the fact that they universally acted in that way gave licence-holders the belief that as long as there was no misconduct on their part they were secure in the tenure of their licences, and there was no power to turn them out on the mere ground that the licences were not required.

Then, my Lords, came a great change. The decision in the case of "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" came almost like a bolt from the blue; and as soon as the full force of that decision was made known it became clear that the magistrates had been acting under a misapprehension for years, and that it was legal for them to consider whether the circumstances of the case justified them in refusing licences on the ground that they were not required. I think no one is surprised that having acted for years in the firm belief that they had not that power, having led the licence-holders to believe that they had not that power, it was not considered that it would be reasonable or equitable for them to turn round on the first occasion when they found that the law was different, and say that, having those powers, they were prepared to do away with licences on those grounds in spite of the fact that they had led the licence-holders to believe that they had secure tenure. Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that the present position is thoroughly unsatisfactory from both points of view.

On the one side you have the large majority of benches of magistrates who decline to make use of their discretion in this direction because they think it would not be equitable, and, on the other hand, you have a few benches, of whom I do not wish to say anything disrespectful, but whose enthusiasm for a reduction of licences has overcome a considerable part of their sense of equity, for we know there were a certain number of cases in which licences were reduced in a somewhat wholesale manner when the magistrates found they had the power. That is the state of things which has to be remedied. I do not think, from whichever point of view you look at it, it can be desirable that that state of things should continue any longer. What is the proposal which the Government now make for remedying it? They propose in the first clause of the Bill that the power to refuse the renewal of an existing on-licence on any ground other than the ground that the licensed premises have been ill-conducted or are structurally deficient or unsuitable, or grounds connected with the character or fitness of the proposed holder of the licence, or the ground that the renewal would be void, shall be vested in quarter sessions instead of the justices of the licensing district, but shall only be exercised on a reference from those justices, and on payment of compensation in accordance with the subsequent provisions.

The Bill goes on to point out how that compensation should be raised. In Clause 3 the Bill enacts that quarter sessions shall, in respect of all existing on-licences renewed in respect of premises within their area, impose charges at rates not exceeding, and graduated in the same proportion as, the rates shown in the scale of maximum charges set out in the first schedule to the Bill—practically that every licence-holder shall pay a charge to this fund assessed on the value of his premises. It is proposed that the compensation which shall be paid out of that fund to licence-holders when their licences are not renewed shall be calculated on certain terms, and the terms laid down in the Bill are, that when a licence is refused a sum shall be paid equal to the difference between the value of the licensed premises, calculated as if the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were applicable immediately before the passing of the Act, and the value which those premises would bear if they were not licensed premises. Therefore, it is clearly laid down how that fund is to be raised and in what manner it is to be spent. It is practically an insurance fund, the premiums of which are paid wholly by the licensed holders themselves. The compensation which they are to receive out of the fund is described beforehand, and therefore when they pay the premiums the licence-holders know to what they will be entitled. The only difference between this and ordinary insurance is that this insurance is compulsory.

I do not wish to deal at any length with the figures or details of this portion of the Bill; but, with regard to the charge which is made upon the licence-holders, I will only say this, that it is a very considerable charge in addition to what licences have been paying before. A difference may arise in Committee as to whether this charge is a sufficient one or not; but, at all events, the Government think that it is a very considerable extra charge put upon the licence-holders, and that it will produce a sum sufficient to do away with a very considerable number of licences year by year. With regard to the point as to how far this fund may be considered sufficient for the purposes for which it is intended, I would like to say one or two words. If the full powers under the Act are used by all the magistrates, the total sum which this fund would amount to year by year would be £1,209,500. I think it will be seen that that is a substantial sum to be raised from the licence-holders of the country.

I am very unwilling to make any prophecies as to the average number of licences that it will be possible to reduce annually by means of this fund; but at all events in the earlier years, the years immediately after the passing of the Act, the houses abolished will probably be the poorer class of houses, houses that are not required and which are not suited structurally to this trade, and, therefore, in the earlier years the fund will probably be sufficient to do away with a larger number of houses than would be possible at a later period, when the houses have increased in value. I know that different estimates have been given. I will only mention one or two of them. I think that a great many of the estimates with regard to the amount which each house will receive are largely exaggerated; but, taking a very moderate estimate, an estimate that the average would be £500, the fund would enable, in one year, no less than 2,420 licences to be done away with. Then, if you take a larger figure, if you take the average sum at £800, it would allow of over 1,500 licences being done away with in one year. I mention this to show that it will be possible to do away with a large number of houses of not very great value, particularly beerhouses, in the earlier years, without increasing the fund.

The next point I should like to call the attention of the House to is how this fund is to be administered. I wish to dwell a little on this point, because I notice that in the attacks that have been made on the Bill in the country it is asserted that it is proposed to take the discretion away from the local magistrates. That is an attack which has been most prominently put forward. There have been petitions after petitions, all putting that question in the forefront, immediately after the question of the time limit, and calling upon this House and the other House of Parliament to throw out the Bill in consequence of the fact that the discretion of the local magistrates is interfered with by it. I ask the House to look at what are the real facts of the case. What is the law as it at present stands? At present the licensing justices are subject to control in two directions. In the first place, if they grant a new licence, the grant of that licence has to be confirmed by the present licensing committee. That committee is very much limited in power, because this is practically the only work its members have to do. It is also limited in numbers, because the Act lays down that it cannot consist of less than three or more than twelve members; and, therefore, it is quite impossible that in a large county the licensing committee can be very representative of the different districts.

With regard to renewals of licences, in every case where the decision of the licensing justices to refuse the renewal is not accepted, there is an appeal to quarter sessions. That is to say, in every case where the licence-holder thinks he is injured by that decision, and thinks he can get it set aside, he has an appeal to quarter sessions, and naturally there is an appeal in the large majority of these cases. The appeal goes to the full Court of quarter sessions sitting as a Court, and is practically a re-hearing of the case, with, as very often happens in such cases, fresh evidence produced which was not put before the magistrates at the original hearing. Now what is the change that this Bill proposes? The Bill proposes that the actual power with regard to the renewal of licences and the giving of new licences shall be exercised by quarter sessions; that these two powers shall always be exercised by a committee appointed by quarter sessions; and the Bill lays down that that committee shall be appointed subject to regulations which will be made by the magistrates and which have to be approved by the Secretary of State. Therefore, it is presumable that the Secretary of State will, as far as possible, insist that that licensing committee shall be a properly constituted committee, and that in the cases where it is possible it shall fairly represent the different districts of the county. More than that, it is especially laid down that this committee shall always have a report made to them from the magistrates who have originally considered the case, and that they shall consider all reports so made to them. They will, therefore, always have before them all the facts on which the magistrates originally came to their decision.

There is also this very important provision, that the Secretary of State, who has the power of making certain rules for carrying this Bill into effect, may, amongst other things, by those rules provide for the consultation of the committee of quarter sessions with the justices as to the reports which they make; therefore, if there is any doubt in the report itself, it may be provided, and will be provided, that the quarter sessions committee in such a case shall personally consult with the magistrates who have made that report. As I have said, this committee of quarter sessions will have the power, not only of dealing with new licences, but also of deciding with regard to the renewal of licences, and I think your Lordships will see that this is a very great improvement in the procedure. Whereas under the old procedure the decision had to be come to by one body with regard to the giving of a new licence, and by another with regard to the renewal of a licence, under this Bill the same body has to consider the two different matters, which are certainly very much akin to one another.

Now, what is the actual change with regard to the taking away of discretion from the local magistrates? The whole difference between what is proposed in the Bill and the present law is this, that with regard to the renewal of licences anybody who so wishes can at present appeal from the decision of the licensing justices, but as the Bill puts it, every case of renewal, whether there is an appeal or not, will have to come before the committee of quarter sessions. I have only dwelt upon the actual changes. I would like to say one or two words about the reasons. It does seem to me that it is not unreasonable that where you have a sum of money provided for doing away with licences throughout a whole county, the county authority should be the authority to deal with it. It might cause great inconvenience and great confusion if different magistrates in different parts of the county dealt with the fund at their disposal in an entirely different manner, and irrespective of what was going on in other parts of the county. I am confirmed in that view by the very strong remarks in the Majority Report of the Licensing Commission, in which it was pointed out that if there was to be a compensation fund, it was most important that it should be administered over a large area, such as a whole county. As the Majority Report points out, you cannot lay down a rule with regard to the number of licences required in different districts when the conditions and circumstances are so varied. In one part of the county a much larger number of licences may be required than in another, and the only fair way of administering such a fund would be for a central body to administer it who are acquainted with the whole circumstances of the case.

I have had some experience as a chairman of quarter sessions myself. I have been chairman for a longer number of years than I like to think of, and I may, in consequence, be considered to be prejudiced in favour of quarter sessions; but this I certainly can say with perfect confidence, that, so far as my experience goes, it would always be the first wish of quarter sessions in these matters to give consideration to the views of local magistrates, and if the committee is, as I hope it will be, made a representative committee, I cannot see that the proposals in the Bill can in any way interfere with the discretion which the local magistrates have hitherto had, and which, I think, they will to a large extent have under the proposals of the Bill.

I now come to what, I take it, is the pregnant point in the Bill—the compensation scheme. I know that the proposal of the Government has been attacked, and is attacked, because there is no time limit put upon the operation of their compensation scheme, and there is an Amendment to be proposed by the noble Viscount opposite, Lord Peel, to the Motion for the Second Reading. It is to the effect that this House cannot accept, as a satisfactory settlement of the licensing question, a Bill which creates a perpetual interest in a terminable licence. Although I cannot say I see it from quite the same point of view as the noble Viscount, yet he has, at all events, selected the words of that Amendment somewhat more carefully than some of the critics of the Bill have on former occasions. But, my Lords, I honestly say I cannot see that the Bill creates a perpetual interest in a terminable licence. How can a Bill under which practically every licence that at present exists may be taken away, supposing your fund is sufficient, and under which neither the State nor any public authority will provide one penny of compensation—how can that Bill be said to create a perpetual interest in a terminable licence?

What the Bill clearly does is this. It does enable the licence-holder who has paid the premiums to receive his share of the compensation fund at whatever period his licence may be taken away. And I myself fail to see how, if it is equitable that a licence-holder, whose licence is taken away in five or ten years from the passing of the Bill, should receive his share out of the fund to which he has contributed, it can be contended that a licence-holder after he has paid a larger number of premiums, after he has paid premiums possibly for fifteen or twenty years, should be entirely debarred from any benefit or from any share of the compensation. I quite understand that there may be other schemes which, in the opinion of the noble Viscount and of other noble Lords, are preferable, but those schemes cannot be grafted on to this Bill. It is perfectly out of harmony with the principle of the Bill to put a time limit at the end of it.

Let me take one instance. There is a quite intelligible scheme—some of the schemes that I have seen are rather the reverse—containing a time limit. In that scheme is contained the principle that every licence-holder should be given a certain period during which he should be entitled to hold his licence, and that at the expiration of that period it should be subject to withdrawal, but that in the meantime he should have the opportunity of recouping himself for the fact that he may lose his licence after a particular date. I merely refer to that because I think that was a scheme to which the most rev. Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury gave his adhesion in a speech he recently made in the country. He said he had no objection to a long time limit, because it was quite fair, if a licence-holder was to lose his licence, that he should have sufficient time to save up in order to recoup himself for that loss. That, I venture to think, is a perfectly intelligible alternative to the Bill now before the House; but that it is a proposal which, either from the point of view of the licence-holders or from the point of view of the public, would meet with much approval, I venture very much to doubt. For what is the effect of it? Up to the time you fix there will be no power whatever of doing away with any licence at all; and, therefore, the whole of these licences, which are now in such excessive numbers, will have to be continued unless the State chooses to step in and find a fund to do away with them in the meanwhile.

I feel the difficulty of discussing an Amendment of this sort, which objects to the general principle on which this Bill is drawn, without knowing the alternative which may be put in its place. I regret, therefore, that an Amendment is to be moved which would practically destroy the Bill, instead of noble Lords waiting for the Committee stage, when the House would have full power of considering what scheme was most likely to be equitable and satisfactory to the public. I would venture to make another criticism on the Amendment. Are noble Lords who support that Amendment prepared to sacrifice all those clauses of the Bill which it has been admitted are valuable improvements on the present law? Are they prepared to sacrifice those clauses in order to get rid of the compensation scheme under the Bill? Even if they feel so strongly about the scheme of compensation, why cannot that matter be left until we come to Committee, when noble Lords can have the whole question discussed?

Let me, in a very few words, point out what I think are the valuable reforms which the Bill makes. I take first the fact that the Bill for the first time recognises that the privileged position of the ante-1869 beerhouses should no longer continue. There is no matter which has been more strongly animadverted upon in this House than the fact that the keepers of the poorest class of house, the beerhouse, should be in a privileged position and that it should be impossible to touch them. It has been represented over and over again that the privileges which these houses possess block the way to all temperance reform. Are we to say, on the very first Bill that proposes to take away their privileged position, that we will sacrifice that proposal because the particular form of compensation proposed to be given them is not entirely approved of?

Then, my Lords, take the provisions in Clause 4. That is a most important clause, and I do not think it has met with the attention in the country tha it deserves. With regard to new licences, it makes most important proposals, and gives the opportunity for very valuable reforms. That clause gives power to the justices of a licensing district, on the grant of a new licence, to attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made, the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters, as they think proper in the public interest; and I can conceive no wider words than those, or words which might have more far-reaching effect in altering the present conditions and in putting licensed houses in a really satisfactory position. Not only that. It is also laid down specifically in that clause that such conditions shall in any case be attached as, having regard to the proper provision for good management, the justices think best adapted for securing to the public any monopoly value which is represented by the difference between the value which the premises will bear, in the opinion of the justices, as licensed premises, and the value of the same premises if they were not licensed. That provision really meets the objections of those who are so dissatisfied with the state of existing licences; it meets their objections with regard to future licences. The monopoly value is to be taken away from the licence-holder and put practically in the hands of the public.

There is another proposal in the same clause to the effect that a new on-licence may be granted for a term not exceeding seven years, but that at the end of that term it shall be considered not as a renewal of the licence, but shall be treated exactly as an application for a new licence. I do not know how largely that provision may be taken advantage of, and it is very difficult to say what may be the full effect of it; but, at any rate, what this particular clause does is to give an opportunity for magistrates to try experiments with regard to the best way of managing public-houses in the future. They can make such conditions as they think fit. They can give a licence for seven years if they approve, and this will be a great advantage in testing what is likely to be the value of such provisions. That, I think, is a clause which even those who are strongly opposed to some parts of the Bill will admit is a very valuable provision as to future licences.

I have given your Lordships some explanation of the principal clauses in the Bill. I do not think it will be necessary for me, having detained you for some considerable time, to go further into the details of the measure—some of which are very intricate—which can be much better discussed in Committee. I have tried to explain the main features of the Bill, and I believe that when those features come to be considered it will be found that they provide a reasonable solution of a very vexed question on fair and equitable lines; that, in addition to that, they make a great advance in temperance reform by making not only possible, but probable, a very large reduction in the present excessive number of public-houses; and that they will enable regulations to be made which will put licensed houses in a much more satisfactory position than they have ever been before. It only now remains for me to move the Second Reading of the Bill, and to commend it to the fair, and, I hope, the favourable consideration of the House.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Belper.*)

VISCOUNT PEEL: My Lords, I ask your indulgence in no conventional sense, while, in as short a space as I can, I state the reasons which, in my opinion, justify me in putting the Motion on the Paper which stands in my name, and the general objections which I have to this measure. The noble Lord, whose candid, moderate, and able statement I fully recognise, has rather implied that I am not justified in putting down an Amendment to the Second Reading of this Bill unless I can suggest a substitute for this Bill. Well, my Lords, before I sit down I hope to offer in very rough outline a suggestion of an entirely different kind from that contained in the Bill. My objections to this Bill are so strong, not only on the ground which I have stated in my Amendment but on other grounds, that I shall respectfully ask your Lordships to divide at this stage.

I would first ask your attention for a moment or two to the circumstances under which this Bill was introduced. I am not alluding to what has passed in the other House. I would be, perhaps, the last person in this House to transgress your Lordships' rules, if I knew what they were, by alluding in detail to some of the circumstances which have curtailed discussion in another place. For the moment I am not alluding to those circumstances. I am alluding to the feeling which has prevailed in the country for the last eight or ten years on the subject, and which culminated in the granting of a Commission by the present Government. I assure your Lordships I am not going to compare the Majority and the Minority Reports, or to enter into small details of controversy which I hope are buried for ever. But what were the circumstances under which the Bill was introduced? There was a very strong and almost unanimous feeling in the country as to the great evils of intemperance. If I were to quote from speeches made by Prime Ministers living and dead I could present to your Lordships a catalogue of very condemnatory epithets. Every class almost in the country was roused by the extent to which the liquor trade had been pushed and the evils it was producing in England. The Nonconformist and Free Churches to an extraordinary degree were unanimous in their condemnation; and as a member of the Church of England I deeply regret to say that, rightly or wrongly, there was prevalent in the country a feeling that the Church of England were not equally strong in their denunciation of the evil, and were, for some reason or other, comparatively lukewarm in the assertion of what the remedy should be. I hope, however, that before this debate closes that misconception, for such I believe it to be, may be utterly eradicated, and that the representatives of the Church of England in this House will realise that there is an immense body of feeling in this country which they could adequately and fully represent, and that they will bring their great authority to bear in responding in some degree to the deep convictions and the earnest aspirations of some of the best minds and characters in England.

I think the one remarkable thing about this Bill is the extraordinary difference of opinion which is held concerning it. You meet one man and he will say that it is a temperance measure; you meet another and he pronounces it a retrograde measure. The Prime Minister himself has declared that if we could see its results we should think it the greatest measure ever introduced in the cause of temperance reform. There are some who think it is a great concession to popular opinion; others there are who think that the public are, I will not say purposely, but effectively, precluded from any concern with, or control of, licences in the future. There are some who think that by the Bill magisterial discretion is increased; there are others who, like myself, think that discretion "cribb'd, cabin'd, and confin'd" in such a way that the authority of magistrates at brewster sessions will, for the future, be a farce and a delusion. I may be wrong in that. I feel so very strongly that the licensing magistrates in brewster sessions have done so well in their great office, and have discharged their duties with such impartiality and fairness, that it requires a very strong case to be made against them before they are deprived of their disciplinary and administrative duties.

The diversity of view regarding the Bill arises, I think, from this fact, that some men look to the motives of the Bill—and I am willing to put the best interpretation on the motives of those who have introduced it—whilst others look exclusively at the way in which it is proposed to carry out those motives in the different clauses and provisions of the measure. I cannot help thinking that a close and searching examination of the provisions of the Bill will show that the motives are not carried out, and that so far from this being a measure calculated to produce temperance reform, it will—I am sorry to say it in the presence of so many who differ from me, but I do say it with a deep sense of conviction—hinder the progress of temperance reform, prevent the reduction of that redundancy of licences which is the great and crying evil of the day, and will tie up the hands of future generations, so far as this Bill can do it, from introducing those reforms which thousands, nay millions, in this country have set their hearts upon.

I may, of course, be met by the assertion that those with whom I am acting have proposed compensation themselves. I for one have always been in favour of compensation. I have always said it is impossible to get the magistrates, or either House of Parliament, to act unless there was some fair and equitable arrangement by which, if licences were taken away, some compensation should be paid to their holders. But what was the compensation that we proposed? What was the consideration that we offered, and what was the advantage given to the public in return? It was not a mere compensation for licences when they were taken away. It was on the following terms that it was proposed. A great scheme of reduction was in our minds, a scheme by which there should be effected in the course of a short time a reduction of half the licences in the country. It was in view of that that we said—"This is a great and sweeping revolutionary change, necessitated by the circumstances of the day, and it must be accompanied by some kind of consideration for those who hold the licences." It was for that reason that we advocated compensation. But the compensation that the Government propose in this Bill is a new and revolutionary principle introduced into the history of licensing legislation.

It is absolutely a new idea that if a licence is taken away it should be attended with compensation. It has never before been heard of in the course of our temperance legislation. There have been multitudes of Acts, it is true. It was said the other day—

> "The trade has always been legislated against."

No, my Lords, it has not. If it has been legislated against for the last three or four centuries, then it is obvious, from the position it holds today, that that legislation has been of very little effect in curtailing its powers and diminishing its privileges. But, be that as it may, compensation with a great national object in view is a very different thing from attaching henceforth to every licence the claim to compensation for abolition, and so for the first time in history transforming a licence—a permission to sell liquor—into a permanent vested interest which cannot be destroyed except on payment of compensation to the holder. That is one of the principles against which, in common with many others, I venture to protest. It is a new principle which will defeat any idea of great temperance reform, and which will tie our hands and the hands of those who come after us in introducing great reforms in accordance with the feeling and convictions of the people.

There is in this Bill a great show of machinery. Licences are to be reduced and great privileges conferred on quarter sessions. There is, as I say, a great show of machinery in the Bill, but where the motive power is to come from I do not know. The motive power, it seems to me, has been taken away. The motive power was in the magistrates at brewster sessions. They knew the circumstances of the case better than anybody else. They were cognisant day by day and hour by hour with all the circumstances of their districts, and now, in spite of what the noble Lord has said, though he has said it with great moderation and clearness—in spite of what he has said their disciplinary power is curtailed, and there is now to be a duality of disciplinary control which will end in this, that between the quarter sessions and the brewster sessions the holder of a licence will snap his fingers at any attempt to remedy his house or his conduct of it.

The compensation fund is the whole pivot of the Bill. It is to be the means by which the extraordinary redundancy of licences is to be reduced. How will the compensation fund act? We have heard it stated that it will reach £1,200,000 annually, a very large sum in itself, but when it is divided amongst all the licensing districts in England and put into water-tight compartments so as to act only in comparatively small areas, I do not think we can look forward to its having any great effect on the redundancy of licences over the whole area of the kingdom. Take the county of Hampshire. It has been calculated by Mr. Shaw Lefevre, who has made himself very conspicuous by his ability in dealing with the licensing question in his own county, that with the sum which will be at the disposal of that great county the number of licences that it will be possible to get rid of in one year will be fifteen at the outside, and anyone who knows the circumstances in the county of Hampshire, which is blessed with far more than its ample supply of licences, will see that it will take a very long time before it is brought to a reasonable condition in this matter, having regard to the reasonable proportion of supply and demand.

I will next take the county of Huntingdon. Referring for a moment to the Minority Report, we did venture to propose a maximum. It was laid down, not as a hard and fast line, but as a sort of indication to the magistrates of the limit beyond which it was not advisable to go in the interests of temperance—we suggested one licence to every 400 of population. If this Bill passes into law it would take 188 years before that county was brought into the happy condition of having only one licence to every 400 of the population. Everything turns upon this compensation. I am sorry to say so, but the Bill is so brief, and so much lies outside it in the rules and regulations which will have to be made, that I am satisfied that if it passes in its present shape, there will be a harvest for gentlemen of the legal profession. About one-half of the Bill was never discussed in the House of Commons at all. The Government Amendments which were introduced as improvements in the Bill—and I recognise some of them as improvements—were never even explained, much less discussed. It is in the brevity of the Bill, and in its constant reference to rules and regulations to be made by the Home Secretary and other authorities that I see great danger in the future, and great hindrance to the smooth working of the Bill. I will take one instance of the procedure of the Bill. The compensation fund has been based upon no intelligible principle. There is no valuation. It is impossible even now to say what is the value of a house subject to the conditions which this Bill introduces, and the value of that house without a licence attached to it. It is impossible to get at any value. The noble Lord stated £500 as the value of a licence.

LORD BELPER: I beg the noble Viscount's pardon. I did not quote £500 as a figure which I expressed any opinion about. All I said was that if it was £500, the number of licences done away with in one year would be 2,420.

VISCOUNT PEEL: I quite admit that; but the noble Lord, when he says "if" it is £500, shows the uncertainty that exists. What opportunity will quarter sessions have of putting a value on these licensed houses? There is a part of the Bill which says that if the parties interested come to an agreement, and quarter sessions think it is a fair agreement, that agreement shall hold good, but that, if not, the question shall be relegated for appeal to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and from them to the High Court. Now, my Lords, suppose a licensed victualler and his tenant have come to an agreement which is very satisfactory to them, who is to test the question whether it is a fair arrangement between the two parties? Is it not quite likely that quarter sessions, bothered and, if I may use the word in this House, badgered by the prospect of having an appeal to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and from them, possibly, to the High Court of Justice, will look with a very lenient eye on an arrangement which may save them so much trouble, and will sanction an agreement which may be utterly and absolutely unfair to the rest of the claimants on the fund? And there will be many claimants sucking at this fund. Looking to the legal expenses of the fund, I very much doubt whether a very great effect will be produced upon the number of redundant licences.

Compensation is one thing when it is given as a *quid pro quo*, as a means of easing the transition from the present state of things to what was hoped would be a new and a better state of things; but when it becomes a question of payment of compensation as a right, when it becomes an essential condition attaching to a licence, does it not strike your Lordships as absolutely necessary to look into the question very narrowly as to who is to be compensated, and what is to be the amount of the compensation? Why should a great brewery company, if they possess the whole of the licences in a particular town, be compensated if two or three of their licences are withdrawn, when, on their own showing, it makes no difference to the drinking: the drinking that would have gone on in the two or three houses that are suppressed gravitating to the remaining houses? The value of the houses that are left will be enhanced, to the great benefit of the brewers themselves, so that they will be paid not only for the extinction of the houses which are lost, but will be absolutely compensated again out of the compensation fund. Is there no danger under this Bill, from the absence of care displayed in the preparation of it, of a man paying on one system and being compensated on another—paying a very small sum into the compensation fund and getting a very large sum out of it? There is really no reason why he should not as the Bill is framed.

I venture to say there must be some more definite statement made as to how compensation is to be allotted, and who are to be the recipients. I have always fully sympathised with a poor man, or with any man, puts his whole substance into a small freehold house, not a tied house, and is then threatened by the magistrates with the loss of everything he has invested. That man has my sympathy, and I do think some scheme ought to be devised by which such a man's interest should be cared for. I am most unwilling, and I am sure your Lordships will be the last persons in the world to be willing to do an injustice to anyone. But in the case of the great brewery companies, who have swallowed up house after house, who have put their tenants in under most rigorous conditions, who monopolise whole territories, who occupy the whole field, when their houses are abolished, I do hope, not that they will have no compensation at all, but that there will be a very rigid examination into the circumstances of those companies and as to the sums which they are respectively entitled to receive.

It is said to be inconsistent with the scheme of the Bill to provide a time limit. Why should it be so? Why is every licence that exists now to be turned into a vested interest? I will not use the word freehold after what the noble Lord has said, and still less after what the Prime Minister has said. Mr. Balfour, in another place, has declared that it is a great fallacy to talk of a freehold, but his explanation comes, in my unlegal mind, to pretty much the same thing, his explanation being that the mere fact that the interest does not come to an end does not constitute a freehold. No, it does not; but an endless continuation of years during which the occupation of a licence lasts appears to me to establish what is perilously near a freehold interest.

The noble Lord says we are under an obligation to propose some counter scheme to this Bill. There is a counter scheme which I think can be easily proposed. I do not presume to do more than merely to sketch it in the broadest outline. Our plan to reduce licences to a reasonable limit, and do away with the terrible evils which attend the redundancy of licences, was to have a national levy. The Government take credit to themselves for enlarging the areas, but this proposal is quite apart from county areas; it was to be a national levy imposed by high licences on the holders of licences. It may be asked, Can they afford it? In my mind I have no limit which I think the licensing trade cannot afford to pay; their profits are so enormous. When you consider that in London the average value which they will pay under this Bill as a contribution to the fund is about £38, to talk of a high licence smothering them or being an injustice to the trade, is, I think, an absurd statement.

They can surely afford a high licence for the purpose of eliminating from their own number undesirable houses, or houses which exceed a reasonable limit. That is compatible with a time limit. If seven years is too little, we would accept more; but at the end of a certain time it is reasonable to say, "You have had time to turn round; you have had this system of mutual assurance; it comes out of your own pockets, but it has been sanctioned by and arranged for by the State." Is it impossible, at the end of seven or, say, ten years, for this great trade, having been taught a system of mutual insurance under Government supervision, to be able to stand on its own feet, and to devise a mutual insurance scheme which should guard it against the terrible evil to which the members of it think they are exposed? High licensing should continue after the licences have been reduced to a certain number, and the high licence would then go to the State for fiscal purposes. A time limit is compatible with a scheme of mutual insurance.

I will not anticipate the Amendment which is to be moved by the most rev. Primate, but I do say we ought to be able to look forward to an end of this interminable system of licences, and to see daylight; we ought to be able to cheer ourselves with the knowledge that there will come a time when licences will be at the disposal of the magistrates to be adjusted and re-adjusted at given periods as they in their discretion think fit. The Prime Minister, I think, has argued it in this way. He has said that at the end of this period of, say, seven years, you are going to hand over every man who holds a licence to the mercy of a public authority, which may at once abolish the licence; but I would ask, Have the licensing authorities hitherto been so exacting? Does the Prime Minister suppose that the magistrates, whether at quarter sessions or brewster sessions are at the end of this period going to indulge in a sort of fervid crusade against all existing licence-holders, and sweep the country clear of them? No such thing will happen. They will be as reasonable then as they are now, but we shall have ceased to attach to this question of reduction of licences this fettering and disabling question of compensation. That is a counter scheme, which holds out a hope of an immediate reduction of licences, and a hope of a time coming when compensation shall not be associated with the idea of a licence.

Viscount Peel.

Is it beyond the wit of statesmanship to devise some scheme of time limit by which justice should be done, not only to licence-holders, but to the public? Is it inconceivable to put these licences up to auction—I do not advocate it—or to grant them only for a term of years, or lease, which would abolish all idea of compensation? If the arrangement for a term of years were coupled with high licences it would preserve the monopoly to the public while taking it away from the individual. I am here met, of course, by the fact that the Government do propose a system of seven-year licences. Gladly recognising the advantage of that scheme, I say that the argument by which the Prime Minister has advocated his seven-year system cuts away the whole ground on which the proposals for perpetuity have been based.

If there are such evils in the present system, as is admitted, if these evils exist, why are we to bear them longer than is necessary? Why not at once, instead of giving a permanent vested interest to all the licences which now exist, treat them as if they were monopolies which were detrimental to the State and harmful to the community, and then introduce your system of leases whereby no harm would be done to anybody? What did the Prime Minister say when he introduced his proposal with regard to seven-year licences? He said—

> "Magistrates under the Bill are obliged to make terms with the new licence-holder which will prevent those enormous monopolies growing up, which I think have been the greatest absurdity of our present licensing law."

And he speaks of the new system as—

> "A system less utterly irrational than the present, under which a monopoly has been allowed to grow up in this country. Parliament in its wisdom has created a monopoly, and has given that monopoly to individuals—a monopoly which we ought to do our best to prevent growing up in the future."

Therefore, if it is advisable to prevent a monopoly growing up in the future, is it beyond the wit of man to devise a scheme by which the present monopoly shall come to an end within a reasonable time? I have put down this Amendment because no hope is held out to us of it coming to an end. Every noble Lord knows how few new licences are granted now; but, even if that system were to come into general operation it would be a standing menace to the existing system. As is we have not had enough of different licence-running concurrently under different circumstances! As if we have not been plagued to death by the 1869 beerhouses, which have been the great difficulty and *crux* of the licensing question, and which the magistrates have not been able to touch except under four conditions, with which I need not now trouble your Lordships! We have had them running *pari passu* with ordinary beerhouses, and now we are to have licences created before 1904, and the seven-year licences running after 1904. Can anything be more confusing and more embarrassing than having this series of concurrent licences on different conditions?

The noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of the Bill claimed as one of the great advantages of this Bill that it put the 1869 beerhouses under the discretion of the magistrates in certain cases. But by this Bill you are giving a value to things which have no value. You are giving a value to things which have been a source of the most tremendous evil in the purlieus of our great towns, and which the brewers have held as a *quid pro quo* in order that they might get some advantage in some rich and growing suburb of the town. I have never been in favour of bartering, because it gives to the person who receives a new licence for the surrender of an old one a vested interest, a claim on the magistrates which he ought never to have been allowed to make. I am bound to confess, however, that it has been productive of a reduction of licences in some places, but without a penny of compensation. The Birmingham system proceeded on the principle of agreement between the brewers and the magistrates. That was going on happily; but now it is at an end, and every rotten beerhouse dating its privileges before 1869 will have its value attached, and will be a fresh source of evil.

How many of these licences have in the past died what I may call a natural death? Take the town of Liverpool. It is wonderful to think how many licences have died in that town of inanition, but now every wretched weakling, every little public-house or beerhouse will be stimulated into prolonged existence by the administration of this potent drug of compensation. There will be no such thing as natural death. If they die they will have a very handsome compensation allowed to them. I submit, therefore, that you cannot regard the inclusion of the 1869 beer houses in this Bill as an advantage. The conferring of this privilege on every kind of licence, so far from being an improvement, is an absolute detriment and loss, and that is one of the reasons why I ask your Lordships to accept the Amendment which I have placed on the Paper.

May I, before sitting down, make an appeal to your Lordships? I do not suppose any one of your Lordships will be actuated in giving his vote on this Bill by any question of expediency. I have no doubt that you are too fond of the right to pursue an expedient; but if right and expediency can be made to combine together in this instance, if your conscientious convictions go to refuse to entertain this Bill as a settlement of the question, then, if I may say so, it will be a great day for your Lordships' House and for the representatives of the Church of England. There is a feeling, as I have said, that the Church of England has not been so strong as it might have been in denouncing this evil, or in bringing forward some plan for remedying it. After all, why are we actuated in this question by such, it may be, imprudent fervour? Why do multitudes of the people of this country feel so strongly on this point? It is for this simple reason, that the trade of which we complain and which we are seeking to confine within narrow and reasonable limits—I say this without any reference to individuals, for I freely admit that some members of the trade are among the most honest and beneficent persons in the community—has made the poor more poor, has added intensely to the misery under which they live, and constitutes, in the proportions it has now attained, a serious menace and danger to the happiness and welfare of the State. I beg to move the Amendment which stands in my name.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out all the words after 'That' for the purpose of inserting the following words, 'this House cannot accept as a satisfactory settlement of the licensing question a Bill which creates a perpetual interest in a terminable licence.'"—(*Viscount Peel.*)

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, on occasions like this it always seems to me that there is an element of difficulty, if not even of unreality, in our discussing at the close of a long session, as though it were a new matter which had come before us, a subject which has been discussed in Parliament for weeks past, and the discussion upon which has formed the subject of a good deal of our reading and a good deal of our thought and conversation. One scarcely knows what to take for granted, or what to suppose is already known, as regards discussions which, having been held in another place, it is in a technical sense out of order for us to allude to here.

It is constantly urged by those who are opposed to the Government measure now befor us that at this juncture no Bill at all is wanted, that matters might be very well let alone. I entirely differ from that statement, and I think that had they been let alone, a good many pledges in more than one quarter in either House of Parliament would have been violated and broken. Some Bill was, in my judgment, indisputably wanted just now. Whether it was exactly the Bill we have before us I am not prepared to say—indeed, I think I am prepared to say it is not. A few years ago we did try in this House to obtain a good deal of what is proposed in the present Bill, and it was a disappointment to many of us that the efforts which were then made proved unsuccessful. But the Bill as it stands has, with all its faults, which I think are not a few, some admirable features. It is a genuine endeavour, as it seems to me, to promote a reduction of licences upon a reasonable plan, although that plan is, in its details, open, I think, to a great deal of the criticism which the noble Viscount has just levelled at it. Secondly, it does distinctly stand to the credit of this Bill that it is a straightforward endeavour to deal with that most difficult and trying of all our problems in licensing matters, the 1869 beerhouses. Thirdly, I am most grateful for the assertion, in a clause which has been introduced during the passage of the Bill through the other House, of what I believe to be the right principle upon which alone legislation of this kind can profitably go forward, namely, that the ultimate ownership of the monopoly value rests properly in the community, or, if you will, in the State rather than in the licence-holder. Therefore, if we can get the Bill elucidated in some of its at present obscure details—details which, as the noble Viscount has pointed out, have not been even explained in the other House —and if we can further get it amended in some of the ways in which it seems to us most to need amendment, I believe that the Bill may yet be made a workable and satisfactory measure, provided there is introduced into it something which will prevent what the Amendment speaks of—namely, the conferring of a perpetual interest upon terminable licences.

The elementary truth that, if we are greatly to reduce the drinking of alcoholic liquor, somebody must be the poorer for our doing so, is often forgotten in dealing with this matter. It is constantly spoken of as though we were to bring about this change without anybody being a penny the worse. If the Bill is going to be a temperance Bill, as the promoters believe and desire it to be, and if it is going to bring about a large diminution in the consumption of alcoholic liquor, it is indisputable that somebody must be the poorer in consequence; it is playing with the subject to try and imagine that, if such reduction be the real result of the Bill, we can at the same time guarantee the present holders of licences and the owners of licensed premises against any loss whatever in the process as years run on. What we desire is to take care that the loss which we think must come about should come about with the least possible measure of unfairness to anybody, and with the greatest smoothness and the best advantage to the community as a whole. It is in our anxiety to find out the right way that we are taking the line that most of us are taking in desiring a good many Amendments, and, above all, the introduction of a time limit.

Everybody now agrees, I believe, that it is desirable that licences should be diminished in number. I need not recall the fact that the majority of the recent Royal Commission were as emphatic as the minority in declaring that a great reduction in the number of licensed premises was desirable. But it is not by any means proved statistically that there is a necessary and absolute connection between the number of licences and the amount of drunkenness. There are not a few people who dispute the fact altogether, and there are, I believe, some even now who would go so far as to say that they disbelieve in any advantage arising from a diminution in the number of licences. We all remember in this House no less an authority than the late Prime Minister the Marquess of Salisbury telling us, in one of those trenchant sentences which remain in people's minds for years, that there are in Hatfield forty bedrooms, and that that did not make him feel any more inclined to go to sleep, and that in a similar way the number of licences in a town did not seem to him to be the least likely to make the consumption of alcohol become less. If that be so, let the argument be remembered when we are asked, as we shall be, to consider what tax the surviving houses are able to bear in the way of levy put upon them. If it is true that the amount of liquor consumed will be as large after a diminution in the number of houses as it has been before, clearly the profit to the surviving houses will be very much greater, and obviously we would have the right to use that as an argument when we come to consider how much these houses will be able to bear for the purpose of paying compensation to the houses that are abolished.

I do not argue in favour of a diminution of the number of licensed houses solely because of the direct or statistical results that might follow in the diminution of drunkenness or drinking. I look far more to the indirect gains that would come from securing better and more careful tenants, and from greater facilities for the supervision of these houses, and, above all, the gain that comes from the lack of that kind of competition which compels the weaker kind of houses to resort to tricks and dodges in order to sell liquor which they would not otherwise be able to sell. For these reasons I share in the general satisfaction which I believe we all feel in looking forward to a considerable diminution in the number of licensed houses throughout the land.

In regard to the financial details of the scheme, I do not claim for the clergy of the Church of England any technical knowledge or capacity more than other men possess. But I do claim for them exceptional knowledge of the manner in which this evil operates in the homes of England, and I believe it is impossible to exaggerate the interest with which the proceedings in your Lordships' House are being watched, in order to see whether we can do anything to make the Bill more satisfactory in all its parts than it seems to many of us to be as it stands.

If your Lordships will accept the principle as to the need for the introduction of a time limit in this Bill, and the need of making that time limit bear upon the scheme for compensation, I for one shall certainly not quarrel about the financial details of the scheme. The noble Viscount Lord Peel has been somewhat severe in the kindly and helpful criticism which he has made on the action or rather the inaction of a good many of the clergy in this particular matter. It is not in that direction that we are accustomed to find ourselves most harshly and sternly criticised. But I am prepared to agree that the clergy and laity alike have been not nearly so keen as they ought to have been in carrying through some strong and drastic measure for reforming what I believe to be, if not the greatest, certainly one of the greatest of the evils by which we are encompassed.

I think it is sometimes forgotten that, as regards financial sacrifices, the Church has been taking a lead in this matter of a very remarkable kind. I believe I am correct in saying that in the last twenty or twenty-two years the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have taken care that when leases have fallen in on town properties over which they exercise control a genuine reform should be made as regards the number of licences that exist. It has been estimated by competent authorities that the values of the licences so surrendered during that period would amount to £300,000, which is practically a donation from the Church to the people, on behalf of temperance. I think these facts ought to be remembered when it is said that those who are responsible for the central management of the affairs of the Church of England are not doing all they might do in endeavouring to promote reforms of this kind. Only a few months ago the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury by a unanimous vote passed a resolution in regard to this Bill, expressing the earnest hope that such Amendments may be accepted by the Government as will more effectively lead to the reduction of licences throughout the country on equitable terms, and declaring its opinion that it is essential to impose a time limit to such arrangements as may be made for compensation. On a subsequent date a large number of the laity were joined with the Bishops and clergy in discussing this matter, and there was nothing to show that there was any practical change of opinion on the part of Bishops and clergy generally as to the necessity of the introduction of a time limit if the measure as a whole is to be satisfactory.

The opposition of the clergy to the present state of things is felt by the trade to create a situation with which they must deal, and they have retorted by vigorously carrying the war into the enemy's camps. The line taken is to state that the real fault lies with the clergy rather than with the publicans, and that public-houses are the most healthful and desirable of resorts, especially for children. I would like to read your Lordships the following quotation from the official journal of the licensed victuallers—

> "It is an undoubted fact that may be proved by statistics that the families of publicans turn out better than the families of the clergy. They obtain a more practical training, are raised in a less exotic and more natural atmosphere, and are taught some useful trade or calling. They very rarely in their moral conduct exhibit foolish or extreme tendencies or eccentricities. From such logic one might easily deduce the conclusion that the public-house is really the best kind of moral sanatorium, nor would such an argument be fallacious. If the proper study of mankind is man, where can you discover a similar academy in which you can become acquainted with all sorts and conditions of men?"

This attitude of the licensed trade towards the clergy has been emphasised in the private correspondence which reaches me. I happened a few nights ago to listen to a debate in the House of Commons, and I received the next day a letter in which I was described as

> "hovering like a bird of ill omen over a den of howling confiscators."

Moreover, we are told that when the time comes for disestablishment we shall see what the result will be of the action we are taking on the question of the liquor laws to-day. I believe I am right in saying that one large association of brewers in Yorkshire have passed a resolution to the effect that for the future all its members are to be committed to the policy of disestablishment and disendowment, as an answer to the action taken by the clergy throughout England upon the question of licensing reform. But we have in all that we are doing in this matter the support of those whose opinions are most worth listening to. I do not know how many of your Lordships have received the circular letter signed by Sir Thomas Barlow, Canon Barnett, Professor Bernard Bosanquet, Sir Victor Horsley, Sir Oliver Lodge, the Master of Balliol, the heads of the Oxford and Cambridge Houses in East and South London, and others, leaders in all that concerns social reform of the best sort. These men, who are recognised as men of quiet thought and wide knowledge, express their opinion as follows—

> "The concession of the right to compensation without any time limit, and without any equivalent advantage to the public, and the curtailment of local power are in our opinion open to the gravest objections, and calculated to obstruct necessary reforms."

It is indisputable that the custom of annual renewal has given to a licence a value that cannot be arbitrarily withdrawn. Goodwill in any trade has a practical value, and this trade should not be made an exception. Therefore, by what is common consent, it has been felt that some compensation or *solatium* ought to be paid to those who are dispossessed for no fault of their own; but the *crux* comes with the application of the principle. No doubt magistrates all over the land have, for many years, shrunk from reduction of licences, because they feared to do injustice to individuals. The Bill proposes to free magistrates from this difficulty, but differences of opinion immediately arise as to the method. The Bill proposes to enact that for all time licences shall have full value paid for them if they are terminated, and to that end a tax shall be levied on those that survive. It is to be a tax—and I emphasise the word, for what are euphemistically called the "contributions from the trade" are to be compulsory and levied by law. If that arrangement—namely, either retain your licence or receive its full money value—is to hold good for all time, then it seems to me we shall be doing exactly what the Amendment says should not be done—creating a perpetual interest in a terminable licence. The noble Lord in charge of the Bill declined to accept that as a definition of what the Bill will do, and if the Bill does not create such perpetual interest there will be no harm done to it by our accepting the Amendment. Perhaps the Government will themselves, on that account, accept it. The Prime Minister, in his criticism of the past action of magistrates, has repeatedly urged that the ultimate ownership of the monopoly value of a licence should revert to the State, admitting that it has in the past been given away by the State to individuals. The harm was done by starting from a false basis of ownership, and a state of things has been created that must be brought to an end. Admitting that a mistake in policy was originally made, I would make the largest possible allowance for possible hardships that may to some extent fall on individuals in correcting that mistake, and should have thought that all that was required was that due notice should be given to owners to enable them to provide against the time when the State would resume that which originally belonged to the State. That view I will ask the House to adopt when the Bill comes to be considered in Committee. Effect is in Clause 4 given to the principle as regards new licences, and I desire to apply it to existing licences also, treating licence-holders with all possible fairness and consideration upon the loss of a monopoly value which they had come to regard as their own property. If we do not take some step to bring about this change we shall be complicating the problem for generations to come and doing scarcely less mischief than has been done in the past by the giving away to individuals property that belonged to the State.

Whether the time is long enough or the terms sufficient are matters of detail on which I am ready to be convinced and to act with more than fairness, with extreme generosity, to present licence-holders. The proposal I desire to make when the time arrives for doing so is as follows—

> "After the end of fourteen years from the passing of this Act, existing on-licences shall not be renewed, but in place of every existing on-licence which is still in existence after the end of such period there shall be granted, at the next ensuing general annual licensing meeting, a new licence for the term of seven years, subject to the provision of Section 4 of this Act, but without the imposition of any payment or conditions under Sub-section 2 of such section other than the conditions (if any) attached to the existing licence. Provided, nevertheless, that such licence may be refused on the same grounds and subject to the same terms and conditions as the renewal of the existing licence might have been refused."

The details of this proposal I will at the proper time explain. It has been said that such a proposal would be open to objection because it would be a system under which no licence at all could be withdrawn for a term of years. That criticism would be fair if the seven years "close" period were at the beginning, but all the difference in the world is made when we enact that during the first fourteen years any one who is dispossessed shall receive full compensation, and then, when the greater part of the work will be done and the worst houses suppressed, will come the period during which the surviving licence-holders will no longer be called upon to pay any compensation levy and will be able to recoup themselves out of the considerably increased profit which is theirs owing to diminution of the number of houses. At the end of the time the whole thing would stop and the country would resume its ownership in the monopoly value. I am prepared to submit to the criticism that this arrangement taken as a whole is too generous, but I wish to avoid anything that might be construed into hardship upon individuals. With twenty-one years to make provision, and during a third of the time no compensation levy to pay, there would be ample time to provide against the contingency that would arise when the country would enjoy its own again and make a new start.

A time-limit is opposed on more general grounds; it is said that good tenants would not be obtained without security against disturbance, and that this would apply especially towards the end of the term. But who are the worst tenants now? Undoubtedly those in the 1869 beerhouses whose security of tenure is so assured. A man would be the more anxious to conduct his house in the best possible manner if his tenure be uncertain, in order that he may secure a renewal. A warning that a licence may come to an end is not really a great deterrent to applicants for licensed premises. In the licensing district for Farnham the magistrates have given to every tenant—not merely new tenants, but to every applicant for transfer or renewal—a notice in the following terms—

> "If the transfer you are applying for is granted the justices wish you to understand clearly that the licence will expire on the 5th of April, and after that date is renewable only year by year in the justices' discretion. If, therefore, you pay a sum on entering which in any way represents fixity of tenure the justices would remind you that if for any reason it should be decided not to renew your licence there is no fund known to the justices out of which you could be reimbursed the money, or any part of it, you may have paid on entering. You are by no means to take it for granted that so long as you do not infringe the licensing laws so long will your licence be renewed. The justices wish to make this quite clear, so that persons taking licensed premises may be fully aware of the conditions under which the licences are granted."

Nothing could be more explicit, but this notice has not had the effect of deterring applicants in one single case. There is, therefore, no reason to fear that we should not be able to secure proper tenants if the arrangement I desire to see brought about came ultimately into force. In support of the argument that the trade cannot afford the introduction of a time limit, it is pointed out that brewery shares have fallen as it is. They have fallen 1·6 per cent., while other investments have fallen five or six times as much, and even Government stocks have fallen 3·5 per cent. Therefore, the brewers' stock, with a war tax at the time, fell an average of 1 per cent., while the Government stock fell an average of 3 per cent. I see no reason why the State should permanently guarantee the trade against possible loss or deterioration in their stock. We are all sorry that anybody should lose money by the passing of laws for the public good; but surely, with twenty-one years notice, arrangements could be made sufficient for their protection.

I trust the Prime Minister's reference to the Bill as "the greatest contribution ever made to the cause of temperance" will prove true, but that will largely depend on whether the Bill is altered in the way some of us desire. There are at this moment in the air many movements in the direction of social and temperance reform. Most of your Lordships desire that a free chance should be given to those who are endeavouring in so many varied ways to set such experiments forward. Their ingenuity will find many new ways of solving the problem in local districts, but if for all time they are to be compelled to follow the provisions laid down in the Bill their hands will be tied. I agree to the full with those who contend that we must not rely on legislation to effect what depends far more upon a steady improvement of the habits of the individual; but surely it is right to add that legislation should help and not hinder or tie our hands. Your Lordships will notice in the Report of the Physical Deterioration Committee published a few days ago how much stress is laid on the expectation of legislative assistance. Because I want legislation to be helpful and not harmful I urge your Lordships to make the changes in this Bill which I believe will transform it into a wholesome measure. Without a time limit the Bill, whatever its merits, will, I fear, distort and disturb our whole position by establishing a permanent right where there was none before. With a time limit, generous, considerate, and ample, and with other Amendments which I hope to see introduced, I believe this Bill may become, not merely innocuous, but even fruitful of good to the life of the English people.

*The Marquess of BATH: My Lords, I venture to interpose in this debate, because although I am unable to speak with the experience of the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of the Bill, I can at all events address your Lordships with some knowledge, both of difficulties which stand in the way of the solution of this great question, and also from the point of view of those who have endeavoured for some time past to balance the principles upon which they believe they ought to act. I desire cordially to support this Bill, because my experience convinces me that it is a thoroughly honest measure, which aims at solving very difficult social problems on the basis of justice and equity. I can remember the days when magistrates in connection with their duties as licensing justices were subject—I will not say to unmitigated abuse, but certainly to very uncomplimentary criticism at the hands of some of those who now pose as their friends and protectors, and who declare that the provisions of this measure are an insult to the justices sitting at petty sessions. I do not suppose that we were ever unduly depressed by that hostile criticism, and I trust that we are not now unduly elated at this exaggerated estimate of our past services. This Bill appears to me to avoid two extremes, and surely of all legislation that of temperance reform should follow the golden mean. The two extremes are very plain. There are those who say that every man shall drink what he likes, and there are those who say that no man shall drink any alcoholic liquor whatever. Those who follow the first dogma are restrained by the licensing laws, by the magistrates who administer those laws, and by the custodians of the peace in our streets and public places; and above all they are restrained by the mass of average public opinion which is ever increasingly on the side of decency, order, and moderation. Those who favour the second dogma are restricted from the exercise of their arbitrary wishes by the overwhelming mass of public opinion, which insists that your legislation shall be founded upon the broad principles of individual liberty—provided it does not degenerate into unicensed excess—of justice] to all classes, trades, and occupations, and of equitable treatment of those who pay taxes to the State; but above all, of confidence in the people themselves that religious teaching, sound education, and healthy social surroundings will induce them to conduct themselves with sobriety, with self respect, and with due regard to the good opinion of their fellows.

The principal features in this Bill, which I venture to think should commend it to your Lordships' approval, are the adoption of a wider area for jurisdiction, the prospect of the steady reduction in the number of licensed houses, the recognition of the principle of equitable compensation, and the surrender of the ante-1869 licences to the control of quarter sessions. The noble Viscount who moved the Amendment described the result of this measure as being to the effect that the powers of the local justices would be cribbed, cabined, and confined. Surely so far from the justices having had unfettered authority in the past, they have been subjected to appeal to quarter sessions in the case of every refusal to renew a licence. By this Bill they are to be actually delivered from that, because quarter sessions will have, in determining the matters which are referred to them, to take into consideration, the report which will be sent up to them for their assistance and guidance by the local justices. If, as is the case, the granting of a new licence is not valid until it has been confirmed by the county licensing committee, an if, as I suggest, the refusal of justices to renew an old licence has always been subject to appeal—a power which has very frequently been exercised—how can it be contended that their jurisdiction is any more fettered by giving to quarter sessions the right also to determine whether the refusal to renew existing licences should be confirmed or not?

Then I should like to say a few words on the question of compensation. Some of the opponents of this Bill have denounced compensation, but would grant consideration; others object to the equity of compensation, but acknowledge its expediency. I would only observe with regard to the so-called distinctions that things which are equal to the same are equal to one another. I would ask your Lordships to consider what happens in the case of a licensed house being demolished for the purpose of some public improvement? The interest of the licensee is taken into consideration, and very justly so, in awarding him compensation, and in indemnifying him, not only for the loss of his premises, but for his holding. Further, how is the interest of the owner of a licensed house treated in this respect? It is treated as a taxable commodity on the sale of a public-house—it is treated as a going concern from year to year with a reasonable expectation of renewal. I own I am not a lawyer, and I am not going to argue whether a publican who conducts his business properly has a legal, equitable, or moral claim for compensation if he is arbitrarily deprived of the business in which he has embarked his capital, and on which his livelihood depends. What I do assert is that it is contrary and absolutely repugnant to the average views and the general instincts as to what is right and fair; it is absolutely contrary to the average opinion of Englishmen that you should tax a man's business on the basis of the tenure being permanent, and that in other respects you should treat him as having no claim to compensation in the event of arbitrary disturbance and deprivation of his holding. Public opinion will not condone confiscation, and it is because I believe that this Bill acknowledges that compensation, properly regulated, should go hand-in-hand with the reduction of licences that I submit it should command the approval of all temperance reformers. Is it temperate, moderate, and practical to say, better have no temperance reform at all than to admit the principle of compensation?

I think it right, however, that I should say that I personally deeply regret the introduction that has been made since this Bill was first laid before Parliament. I refer to the sub-section in Clause 4, which creates a wholly new form of on-licence. New licences are to be granted for seven years, during which period, as I understand, they will not be subject to annual renewal, but at the end of that period their renewal may be refused without compensation being given. The Government, in my opinion, most properly and wisely refused to insert a time limit on the compensation for old licences; but I fear that under this dual control you will have friction and jealousy, and a rankling sense of insecurity and injustice on the part of the seven-years licence-holders. I foresee an agitation to put all licences on an equal footing, and that agitation will take the form, not of granting compensation to the new licences, but of taking it away from the old. I am bound to say that I regret that that proposal, which was not originally contemplated by the Government, should have been grafted on to a Bill otherwise so equitable, and that an opportunity should thus be provided for future strife and, it may be, future injustice.

The Marquess of Bath.

With regard to the Amendment of the noble Viscount and the Amendment of which notice has been given by the most rev. Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury, it seems to me that the suggestion of a time limit upon that compensation which is to be provided by the trade would, if accepted, work a very serious injustice. It is, I grant, quite possible that financial provisions could be framed which might get over the difficulty, but under the proposed scheme you will have, at the end of the time limit, those very licence-holders left without compensation who, during the existence of the time limit, have provided compensation for their fellow-traders. Social legislation, to be useful and successful, must be directed not only to the wants, the welfare, and the comfort of the vast majority of the nation, but must also appeal to their sense of what is right and fair. The English people are not a nation of drunkards. They are not prone to excesses whether in eating or drinking. They are a people, as a whole, essentially sober in thought, judgment, and habit, and it is for the people as a whole that Parliament is called upon and ought to legislate. It has been said that you cannot draw up an indictment against a whole people, and you cannot, by Act of Parliament, deprive the whole nation of alcoholic drink without arraigning the people, as a body addicted to excessive drinking, incapable of self-control, and unfitted for the exercise of their individual liberty and private judgment. The author of the saying which I have just quoted also laid down the maxim upon which I believe this Bill and every successful legislative effort must be based. He said that "all government, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and prudent act, is founded upon compromise and barter." But what does this Bill propose to do? It proposes to reduce the opportunities of drinking by reducing the number of houses from which drink can be obtained. It proposes to restrict the opportunities for temptation of the weaker and less well-conducted and less well-informed minority of the people. But in doing so it seeks to avoid the injustice of confiscation of the property of orderly and well-conducted members of the community, who have embarked their property in a business which is licensed by the State and demanded by the legitimate requirements of the people. I claim that this Bill is founded on the principles enunciated by Mr. Burke as of the essence of all government, of every human liberty and enjoyment, of every virtue and every prudent act. It is essentially a temperate measure, promoted in the interests of temperance. It is a Bill which if it is added to the Statute Roll will mark the first real effort for over a generation in the cause of temperance reform, which will convert platform promises into Parliamentary performances, translate the platitudes of the agitator into the actions of a responsible Legislature, and substitute for the frenzies of the impractical fanatic the sober schemes of the practical statesmen, who, I believe, are is yympathy with the nation which they lonally strive to serve.

*Lord SHUTTLEWORTH: My Lords, if on rising for the first time to address your Lordships I make a claim upon your indulgent consideration, I can assure you it is no empty form. I would especially claim the indulgence of those Members of your Lordships' House within whose recollection may still lurk some remembrance of the transition from the other Chamber of the Legislature, and who may have been accustomed to speak in that House, where one is assisted by the expressions of approval and disapproval which meet orators in that Assembly. I may perhaps say that I have been accustomed to swim with corks, and I am afraid that that kind of assistance is not so usual in this House.

I will not attempt to set up again the case which was so eloquently and firmly built up in the moving of the Amendment by the noble Viscount. It is not necessary—especially as the views which he expressed and the principles he laid down have not been traversed by subsequent speakers—that I should go over the ground of his speech. I may perhaps be allowed to express the pleasure with which I have listened to a speech of great ability delivered by the noble Marquess, whom I recognise as one with whom I have sat in another place, but I think there will be very few in this House who will go the length in supporting the Bill that he went. We have heard several expressions lately, such as "out-and-outer," "whole-hogger," and so forth; I think that, so far as this Bill is concerned, the noble Marquess is entitled to the epithet "whole-hogger." The earlier part of his speech was to a large extent devoted to pushing an open door. I do not suppose there is a Member of your Lordships' House who is not prepared, in one form or another, to recognise the principle of compensation; and I do not think there is any Member sitting upon this side of the House who is prepared to say, after all that has happened in the past, that we can take away the interest which has been acquired by the owners of public-houses through the practice of magistrates without some compensation, whether it be in form of time, or of money, or possibly of both. But when the noble Marquess went on to say that all he wanted was a steady reduction in the number of licensed houses, by which, I am afraid, he meant a slow reduction, my agreement with him ends. I should like to see the evils from which this country and the homes of the working classes suffer removed not at the very slow rate to which he pointed, but at a much more rapid and effective rate.

My Lords, I will not attempt to go over all the points, but I will select those which have most impressed themselves upon my own mind. In the first place, this Bill is a totally new departure in several respects. I will take two points in particular. The first is a point upon which a good deal has been said to-night, and upon which, therefore, I will not dwell longer than I can help, viz., that a freehold or perpetuity value is being bestowed upon that which is an annual licence; and the second is that the local magistrates in small areas are no longer, except in the case of county boroughs, which have not been alluded to to-night, to have control of this matter. I will deal with the latter point first. The noble Viscount who moved the Amendment alluded to the good work which has been done by brewster sessions in the past. I will not follow him on that point, because he stated very fully and ably what brewster sessions had done and how much better fitted they are for certain purposes than persons less intimately connected with the locality. But I may point to this—that the spirit of past legislation on the licensing question, even if you go back to a considerable period, has been based on the principle that the local magistrates should have the responsibility. Why has that been? Because the local magistrates are those who are best acquainted with the wants of the locality. This has been brought home to me with very considerable force by my experience in the county with which I am connected—the county of Lancaster. I have seen the repeated efforts of non-county boroughs—and particularly of one non-county borough—to reduce the number of licensed houses and the temptations which they afford. I have seen these efforts with great sympathy, and some of them have been defeated by the action of quarter sessions, action taken no doubt most conscientiously, but without the advantage of the local knowledge upon which the action of the local magistrates was based. That has been a great grievance. During the time I represented a Division of the county in the House of Commons it was brought under my notice over and over again, and the hope which has filled the breast of those who have seen the evils which spring from the continuance of an unnecessary number of licensed houses, has been that the next step in legislation would be to take away the appeal to quarter sessions, and to leave the decision of the local justices as final. What a discouragement and disappointment is this Bill to local magistrates in that respect, and not to the local magistrates only, but to the communities over which they have jurisdiction!

Now, my Lords, I come to the point of the value of the licences. I think the objections that we have to the system of compensation set up in this Bill would be met by the insertion of a time limit. There is a general feeling, at all events amongst those on this side of the House, and I think it is shared by many on the other side, that something considerably less than perpetuity, and less than the speculative value which individuals are ready to give for these houses, is due, and that the justice of the case would be met by a time limit. I will venture to express my own personal opinion as to the form which I think the time-limit might best take. The argument has been used over and over again that there would be a danger that at the end of the time fresh claims for compensation would arise. I think there are many answers to that argument, but an unanswerable case would be set up against it if the compensation were in a graduated form, and if the time limit were such that compensation would be given in a diminishing amount from year to year. For example, if the time mentioned by the most rev. Primate were adopted, namely, fourteen years, and if two-fourteenths were given in the last year but one, and one-fourteenth in the last year, I think it would be an outward and a visible sign to all persons concerned that the time for compensation was drawing to an end, and that at the end of the time limit it would come to an end. I confess I should myself greatly prefer that to the form of time limit which the most rev. Primate has announced his intention of proposing in Committee. He suggests twenty-one years, but I feel averse to continuing the evils from which we suffer for so long a period. The most rev. Primate laid great stress upon our giving liberal compensation, and our treating extremely liberally those from whom something was to be taken away. I am thoroughly in favour of treating them fairly and even generously, but I do not see why we should go to an extreme of liberality.

Who, after all, are the people who suffer? It is the working classes of this country, and the working women in their homes; they suffer from the evils which arise from so large a proportion of the income of the working classes being spent upon drink. Under this Bill a terminable licence is treated as a freehold or perpetuity, and an insecure tenure is converted into what has been called a fixity of tenure. Why this endowment? We are all acquainted with brewers; the owners of the retail trade are persons known to us, and so are the directors of brewery companies. They are not a particularly distressed or suffering class; they are not a class who have special claims upon us for compassion. I have no doubt some of your Lordships may be to some extent unconsciously influenced by the fact that these men are personally excellent men, whom you have known at school and at college, on the cricket field and on the river. They are admirable persons in their domestic relations. But I think your Lordships' feelings ought not to be worked upon too easily. I sometimes wish that my friend the brewer could be transplanted from his domestic hearth, and that, instead of spending his evenings agreeably at his billiard table, or in a game at bridge, he could be carried to two scenes in succession. The first scene to which I should like to take him would be one of his own tied houses, where he might see what was actually going on, and with what results the wages of the working men were spent. The second scene to which I should like to transplant him would be the home of that working man, where he might see the wife, her struggle to do her duty by her children, to clothe and feed them properly, and to keep a decent home. What brave creatures those wives are! In Lancashire I have known many cases of the better cotton operatives who make a great struggle to keep their wives at home, instead of sending them to the mill. Two great evils which arise there, are the spending by the working man of his income at the public-house and the sending of his wife to the mill. I was conversing only the other day with a man who has risen high in the working classes, and who now holds a responsible position at the head of one of the great trades unions; he was telling me his own experience, how, as a young weaver, with a wife and two or three children, and earning wages of 23s. a week, he was extremely anxious to keep his wife at home from the mill. But how did he do it? He did it by spending next to nothing upon himself, he drank no beer and he smoked no tobacco. As I say, I wish the great brewers could see something of the lives of these people in their homes, that they could see how those lives are ruined by the way in which wages are spent in these tied houses. The brewers and the directors of brewery companies have no special claim upon Parliament to indulgence, endowment, or excessive compensation. They have a claim to justice, and that we are all prepared to give, but they have no claim for more. We are opposed to going beyond just compensation, especially in the case of a trade like this; we are opposed with all our might to the idea of converting these terminable licences into freeholds, and giving a dole to the brewery and a handsome endowment to the liquor trade. I think we are bound to remember that every man who enters this trade and becomes the possessor of a public-house invests his money in a speculation; he enters into the business with a full knowledge of the law and of the uncertain nature of his tenure, and the most rev. Primate has reminded your Lordships that it has of late been the practice, at any rate of some benches of magistrates, to give a special warning to owners of public-houses as to the real nature of the tenure under which they hold.

Now, my Lords, may I say a word or two on the source of the fund for compensation? The noble Marquess opposite alluded to this subject, but I do not think that otherwise it has been referred to in the course of the debate. The compensation comes out of a tax which the State had a perfect right to impose and very likely presently would have imposed for general purposes. If you look at the taxation on licensed houses in other countries, and especially in the United States of America, you will find that the licence duties are very much higher than in this country. The noble Viscount who moved the Amendment alluded to the fact. And the average tax on a house in England is £38, whereas in the State of New York it is £240. The only wonder is that the tax to be imposed under this

Bill—aye, and a great deal more—was not imposed long ago upon this rich and flourishing trade for the general benefit of the people of the country. Therefore, the claim that the trade itself pays the compensation is subject to that qualification. But if, for the sake of argument, we grant that the trade pays, I am prepared to argue that it scarcely pays in the right way. The noble Viscount alluded to cases in Hampshire. I also cite a case in Hampshire which was brought to my notice by a pamphlet written by Mr. Shaw Lefevre. He mentions a village in which there are six licensed houses and a small population, and in which he says there would be only one opinion in the minds of all respectable persons, namely, that the houses are certainly double the number that the requirements of the place demand. They all belong to one owner, curiously enough not a brewer but a collegiate owner. This college owns the greater part of the land in the parish. If these licensed houses were reduced by one-half, what would happen to the college? Under this Bill it would receive compensation out of the county fund for the three houses that were suppressed, while the three remaining houses would be increased, perhaps doubled, in value by the process, and therefore the owners would receive compensation twice over. I will not pursue the point further, but if any one wishes to see further facts he need only refer to Mr. Shaw Lefevre's pamphlet and read the remarkable facts there given about Basingstoke and Portsmouth.

I quite recognise that this Bill has been improved since its introduction. The other House has done something, in spite of the conditions under which the Bill was debated, and in consequence of which only a fraction of the Bill came under consideration, but the most fatal blemishes remain. Here, then, is your Lordships' opportunity. You possess an independence, a knowledge, and an experience as magistrates and landowners, which specially fit you for dealing with this subject. Your Lordships know what are the evils arising from the multiplication of temptations, the growth of the tied-house system, and the overriding of the local knowledge of divisional benches by quarter sessions, and your Lordships can surely see what mischief will come of converting into fixity of tenure the present insecure tenure of licensees, the brewers, and their servants. There is one respected section of this House to which perhaps a member of the Church of England may specially appeal on a question so vitally affecting the social and moral well-being of the people. But I would appeal not only as a member of the Church of England. The right rev. Prelates sit in this House as representatives of the State Church; every citizen belongs by right to that State Church, and therefore all earnest citizens of the country who desire to see one of the greatest blots on its fair fame and well-being removed, are looking to the right rev. Bench on this question. They have special experience to help them. Right rev. Prelates who sit on that Bench have had parochial experience, and they know that it is no rhetorical flight to speak of the fight with the demon of drink, because the demon of drink has been one of the greatest obstacles to their work when they have been in charge of parishes, especially in the great towns of the country. It seems to me that they have a great opportunity. If by the action of the right rev. Prelates this measure is purged of the vice which is attacked by the noble Viscount's Amendment, they will have rendered a notable service to humanity, and gone far to justify the exceptional position which they occupy in this House of the Legislature. If, however, they are found wanting, may I venture to say that they will have failed to seize that "tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune," and, if I may finish the quotation, may I remind them of the warning that—

> "Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
> And we must take the current when it serves,
> Or lose our ventures."

and with those ventures are bound up the happiness of thousands of British homes, the welfare and the prosperity of the people, and the stability of the commonwealth.

Lord Shuttleworth.

The House adjourned for a short time.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: My Lords, the noble Viscount who moved the Amendment, and also the last speaker before the adjournment, spoke against this Bill, largely on the ground that it does away with the discretionary power of local justices—a course of action which they consider in itself to be wrong and extremely disadvantageous to the cause of temperance, their view being that the local magistrates are likely to know the needs of the locality, and that it is a retrograde step to interfere with their discretion and refer the matter to quarter sessions. I think it is admitted that the two great difficulties which meet us in trying to deal with this question of licensing reform are, first, the tied-house system, and, secondly, the unnecessary number of public-houses. In regard to both these difficulties I would ask whether it can really be denied that they are very much due to the action of the local magistrates in the past. I remember talking this matter over with Mr. Gladstone, and I recollect very well his saying what an evil he felt the tied-house system to be, and how it was an evil which might have been avoided. I quite admit that it is an extremely difficult matter to deal with at the present time, but it is a very serious element in this question of licensing reform. It would always have been possible in the past for the local justices in granting new licences and in renewing or transferring old licences to call for the agreement or the lease of the owner of the property. The idea was one public-house and one only, and the fact that the magistrates have not taken that course in the past is one of the causes of the tied-house system being so general at the present time. The growth of that system has made the difficulty of dealing with the licensing laws infinitely greater than it need have been. In the second place, the difficulty is surely partly due to the action of local magistrates in this way. We are face to face with an excessive number of public-houses. I have no sort of wish to blame local magistrates at all; I am quite aware of the difficulties of their position; but I think he would be a bold man who would say that local considerations have not had something to do with the granting of licences in the past. Therefore, I for one confess that I am extremely glad of the provisions of this Bill by which the matter will be referred to quarter sessions, because I believe it will have a very salutary effect in regard to the granting of licences for local reasons.

Then, my Lords, I sometimes doubt whether it is sufficiently realised by those who find fault with this Bill how extremely difficult it is to close public-houses. Will your Lordships allow me to state a fact out of my own knowledge which occurred only last autumn in South London? The right rev. Prelate who presides so admirably over the diocese of Rochester, with a good many clergymen and dissenting ministers, approached the justices of the Newington Division in South London with a demand for the reduction of licences. The magistrates said that they were fully alive to the difficulties of the situation, that they were entirely at one with the Bishop and those who accompanied him in regard to the need for a reduction in the number of licences, and that, whatever His Majesty's Government might be going to do, and that whatever might be the provisions of the Bill that was to be introduced, they had marked down ten licences for extinction. I happen to know these circumstances, having some relation to South London myself. What was the result? Here you had every conceivable circumstance which should have led to the reduction in the number of licences, but what was the actual result? The owners of eight out of the ten public-houses marked down for extinction were able to produce such evidence as to the need for their houses and the general satisfactoriness of their character, that the magistrates found themselves quite unable to withdraw the licences, and out of the ten only two were withdrawn, one of which was a house in such a dilapitated condition that it was perfectly useless trying to preserve it, and in regard to the other there was some difficulty about the lease which made it nobody's interest to contest the withdrawing of the licence. The noble Viscount who moved the Amendment and the noble Lord who spoke last, seemed to speak as though members of the Church of England and the right rev. Bench were less interested in getting rid of the excessive number of public-houses and less anxious to promote a measure of reform and to put down drunkenness than some of the leaders of the Free Churches. I venture to think that there are no persons who desire more to do what they can to remedy the great evil of drunkenness than the members of the Church of England, and I am quite sure that there are none who desire to do more to remedy those evils than the members of the Episcopate. But I think the members of the Church of England, and probably the Episcopal Bench, have a greater sense of proportion and a greater sense of justice than appears to be possessed by some of the leaders of the Free Churches.

*LORD SHUTTLEWORTH: Perhaps the noble Viscount will forgive me for interrupting him, but he is not quoting me correctly. I cannot answer for my friend the noble Viscount who moved the Amendment, but my recollection of his speech does not bear out the statement the noble Viscount has just made.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: Of course, I entirely accept what has fallen from the noble Lord. I understood him to say that the Episcopate, at all events, were at this moment on their trial before the country in regard to the action they would take on this Bill. I entirely withdraw my statement if I have in any way misrepresented him. For myself I do not believe that you are going to make men temperate by Act of Parliament. I think Parliament may do a great deal to withdraw temptation from their way, but as to supposing that you are going to make men sober and moral by an alteration of the licensing laws or by any Act of Parliament, I do not believe you can do it. But I think there is a great deal that might be done, and there is much that I should like to see added to this Bill. I should like to see something more done to deal with the question of tied houses. I should like to see some steps taken to prevent the adulteration of beer. It is well known that one of the greatest possible evils is the adulterated stuff which is sold to people for drink instead of pure malt liquor. Above all things, I should like to see something done to deal with the question of clubs. Anybody acquainted with the state of the country knows that clubs are a much greater instrument of demoralisation than public-houses. They are at present under no necessity of obtaining a licence, they are not under police supervision, and it would be a very desirable thing that they should be compelled to have a licence, that they should be legislated for like public-houses, which they practically are. If we could see such an enormous reduction of licences as the noble Viscount who moved the Amendment contemplated, I have very little doubt that it would lead to an increase in the number of clubs, and that, I think, would be a very deplorable result so far as the sobriety of the nation is concerned.

It is not always the best-sounding schemes that really promote temperance. The most rev. Primate alluded to a measure which passed your Lordships' House some time ago by which children were prevented from going to the public-houses to fetch beer. What could sound more admirable than a provision of that sort? Yet I believe that those who are most acquainted with the workings and the real ins-and-outs of the matter are by no means sure that that alteration of the law has been to the advantage of temperance. Under the old system the amount of beer was put ready for the children, they stayed hardly a moment in the public-house, and they took the beer home; whereas the result now is that the wife has to fetch the beer, and she is much more open to the temptation to stay in the public-house. It is well known that within the last few years the increase in female drunkenness has been very great, and those who are best acquainted with the facts of the case are by no means sure that there is not some relation between that increase and the alteration of the law by which children were prevented from being sent to fetch the beer. At all events, it is certain that in many cases the result has been that people have kegs of beer in their own houses, and that instead of sending for the quantity they require, they have beer ready to hand, and, consequently, it is doubtful whether the alteration has really made for the increase of sobriety. The real truth about this question is that a moderate and possible scheme of reform has, up to this time, been defeated by the extreme intransigents of the teetotalers, who have objected to any scheme of reform that was possible, with the result that nothing has been done.

I think the most hopeful element of the scheme before your Lordships' House is the proposal for compensation, which really does remove one of the greatest difficulties in the way of refusing licences to houses which are otherwise well conducted. It is really impossible to disregard equity on this subject. I do not know whether your Lordships followed certain proceedings not far from this place a few weeks ago. The laity representing the Houses of Convocation of the Provinces of York and Canterbury met at the Church House and gave a general support to this Bill on the ground that it was a reasonable effort likely to do something in the direction of really enabling magistrates to reduce within reasonable limits licences which otherwise they would find it extremely difficult to deal with. It is quite open for some to say that the magistrates can now do what they like, and that there is no vested right in a licence. That is true, but there is such a thing as equity in the matter, and I entirely endorse what has fallen from the noble Marquess opposite to the effect that the ordinary sense of justice in Englishmen will not admit that those who are heavily taxed, and who pay heavy probate duties upon their houses, should have their licences withdrawn without due and proper compensation.

Then, my Lords, if I may add one word, as to the time limit. It seems to me that if it is just to give compensation to those who have licences now, it will be equally just at the end of any time limit that might be proposed, and I cannot conceive how it will be possible, having granted compensation under existing circumstances, to refuse equal compensation to those whose licences are refused at the end of the time limit. I would add in conclusion, that it seems to me—than whom there is nobody more alive to the dreadful ravages that drunkenness produces in the country and to the great need for everything possible being done to make drunkenness difficult—that this measure of the Government is a well-considered measure, dealing with a very difficult subject, and I am very much disposed to agree with what fell from the Prime Minister when he said that if this Bill was carried and well worked it would mark an epoch in temperance reform, and be a very efficient and helpful measure in the way of bringing about a diminution of the evils which we all deplore.

LORD FARRER: My Lords, I rise in opposition to this Bill because I do not believe that it is really a measure of temperance reform. I should not have risen were it not that I have been for the last three years chairman in my county of a scheme which is generally known by the name of Earl Grey, by which an attempt is made on lines other than legislative to promote temperance. Before I go into the question of why I believe this measure will not conduce to temperance I should like to enter a humble protest, as an individual Member of this House, against the way in which we have been treated upon a matter of such extraordinary importance and complication. We were told by the noble Earl who introduced the Bill, that it was quite evident that such a change had been made by recent practice that it was necessary suddenly to introduce legislation. I venture to think that for 300 years the course of legislation on this subject has gone on without much interruption, and on the whole in accordance with the wishes of the country, and that there was no reason whatever for the enormous hurry by which we are asked to consider in forty-eight hours a measure that entirely changes the history of licensing legislation for 300 or 400 years. I say that this is another instance of what I think is far more important than the individual Bill, namely, the growing power of the Executive in this country, which, in my opinion, is a danger which has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.

I do not believe, my Lords, that there was any call for this Bill. I will go back to what I said was my main reason for rising on this occasion, namely, the experience that I have had, which is perhaps somewhat different from that possessed by most of your Lordships. It is an almost daily experience in conducting three or four public-houses on the trust system, and I think in the common English phrase that an ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory. I certainly do not think that the measure now proposed will induce temperance in this country. The nominal reason for the measure given by the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading was that there were admittedly too many licensed houses. Of course we may all say—

> "How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds
> Makes ill deeds done."

But I am glad to be in agreement with the noble Lord that that is not the main or the only reason for attempting a measure of temperance reform. Under the scheme of the Bill. if carried out, the number of houses that may be reduced is so small that it will really be of no value in reducing drinking. As far as my experience goes, the root evil is in the interest which the worst class of house has in pressing the sale of liquor in opposition to the sale of other refreshments. Nobody who has dealt practically with this question can doubt that that is a very real evil which can only be increased under this Bill, by the making of the sellers of alcoholic liquor into a privileged class by themselves. Throughout the whole of England 80 per cent. of the fully licensed houses are tied houses, while in my own county the percentage is 90. In my opinion the tied house is the greatest enemy of temperance that exists. It is not only because the tied house is bound to sell practically as much liquor as it possibly can, but because there is no real interest to the individual managing the business to sell anything else but alcoholic liquor, that there is no interest in altering the character of the house.

Perhaps I may best illustrate what I mean by an illustration of one of our own houses. When we took it over, the sale of alcoholic liquors represented 60 per cent. of the total gross receipts, while the non-alcoholic liquors and other refreshments represented only 40 per cent., but within six months, by giving the manager an interest in the sale of non-alcoholics, we exactly reversed the proportions, and I am glad to say that in the two years we have had to deal with the experiment we have trebled the takings, and the proportion of non-alcoholic to alcoholic liquors is still increasing. That, I think, shows that in an ordinary common public-house much can be done in altering the character of the house and of the refreshments supplied. I was much struck with that fact as recently as Saturday last, when I was at one of our public-houses on the road to Goodwood. The manager told me that dozens of people had been refused because they were in a semi-drunken condition. But what is the case with the ordinary manager of the tied house on such occasions? His interest is to sell to these men, provided the police are out of the way, and to let them go and lie on the roadside. Anybody who cycles or travels along the roads of the country must have seen near any race meeting half-drunken people lying about the roads, and as long as the manager knows there are no police about he will naturally have an interest in serving these people who may be in a doubtful —or an undoubtful—condition. I am sorry to say that the tied-house manager has every inducement to follow that course, and I think you may take it that the managers of these houses are put in for the sake of selling as much liquor as they possibly can. I do not wish to quote my own experience only. I will quote from the organ of the licensed victuallers themselves, the *Licensing World*. What does that journal say?—

> "Men of little standing and less experience will commence to trade on borrowed capital, for which they will have to pay heavy interest, owing to the uncertain character of the only security they can offer. Such men will not be particular as to the means they adopt to draw customers, and even if they succeed in avoiding any conviction which would forfeit their licence, they know they will lose it at the expiration of a fixed period."

I admit that that is the strongest possible condemnation of the present system. It means, in fact, that we are to support a much larger number of police for the sake of seeing that a certain set of people do their duty. Why should we be asked to do this? We are asked to do it because it is said that it is an injustice to people to deprive them of their licences without compensation. I am rather afraid, after all the discussions we have had for so many weeks, to refer your Lordships to the elementary question of what a licence is. When I consider these questions I always like to go to a good Tory source for my inspiration. I, therefore, looked out the words "licence" and "licenser" in the dictionary of Dr. Johnson, a Tory of the most robust character, and also an Englishman of the most independent mind. If the

House will allow me I will quote his definition of what a licence is—

> "To license is to permit by a legal grant. . . . A licenser is a granter of permission, commonly a tool of power."

A licence is a grant for certain purposes by the public, represented by the Government, to an individual. I should like at the same time, as it has not yet been quoted, to refer the House to the principal Act that governs the question of licensing—the Act of 1828. What are the words of that Act, under which every one of these people holds his title? The reference is to George IV., cap. 61. sec. 13—

> "Every licence which shall be granted shall be granted for one whole year and no longer."

I utterly fail to understand the reason why we are going in future to grant not only new licences for seven years, but to allow the licences that were granted under that Act to go on in perpetuity, unless, indeed, one may take the view of a cynical friend of mine who said to me, "However immoral the measure may be, at least we get 10,000 Conservative election agents throughout the country."

But there is a further reason why I think we should hesitate before adopting this very stringent change in our legislation. No one has ever proved to me that the insurance of existing licences is impossible. In our own houses we have found no difficulty whatever in insuring with the Licensing Assurance Corporation, and I believe I am right in saying that that corporation is most prosperous and does an extremely large business. The original prospectus put forward by the corporation would prove this. In 1898 the company stated that—

> "The objects of a licensing insurance is to remedy the defects of the security of the investments in licensed property, owing to the licence in which the chief value lies being an annual grant liable to forfeiture or non-renewal."

In the same prospectus they say that—

> "The continuity of the licence is entirely at the discretion of the magistrates, whose decisions are granted upon the evidence brought before them every year as to the suitability of each house, the manner in which the business has been conducted, and the needs of the neighbourhood."

The proposal forms issued by the company state that they now insure £60,000,000 worth of licensed property as against £30,000,000 worth in 1899. That does not look to me as if there were any serious difficulty in insuring licences.

But even supposing that objection fails, I object to the Bill as it stands because it appears to render impossible all chances of experiments in other directions. If your Lordships will look at the wording of the Bill, you will see that it leaves to quarter sessions what is said by the Prime Minister to be an ample field for new experiments. But what is the real interest of quarter sessions? As regards the old licences, they are not allowed to be freehold, but a 999 years lease is very much the same thing as a freehold. At any rate, if quarter sessions, or in the old days the magistrates, wished to suppress one of these houses, it is perfectly evident that there was a tendency, though it was not legal, to take the surrender of certain bad licences in its stead. It appears to me that under the wording of this Act that tendency will be strengthened, because it will be in lieu of an actual payment of compensation; therefore those surrenders will put the brewers who have bought up these worthless licences all over the country in a stronger position than ever.

As regards the new licences, I see no reason whatever why quarter sessions should not put them up to the highest bidder. I am afraid from my experience in my own county that the demands for taxes of all sorts are going up, and the interest of quarter sessions will undoubtedly be to get as much as they possibly can for new licences. I should like to quote again from the brewers' paper, the *Licensing World*, a sentence that seems to show that what I say is correct. It says—

> "If the Licensing Bill passes in the form in which it has emerged from Committee—and with a few minor alterations it seems destined to do so—the trust will have to buy in the open market any new licences it may desire to acquire in villages, on such terms and conditions as the licensing authority may impose, and the payment of 5 per cent. seems even more problematical than ever."

I venture to ask your Lordships not to give a Second Reading to this Bill for four reasons: first, I think it will lead to worse administration in the country; second, that it will confirm the brewers' monopoly; thirdly, that it gives taxable money of the public away without any real return; and fourthly, that there is no real feeling on the part of the country in favour of such a measure.

*EARL GREY: My Lords, the noble Lord who has just spoken may be perfectly correct in his law, that there is no legal necessity for compensating a licensee whose licence the licensing authority refuses to renew, but I think this is not altogether a question of law. The problem before Parliament is one which calls upon us to exercise our common sense. We have to settle how we are to bring about a reduction in the number of licences without doing injustice to any party concerned. I hope I shall be able to satisfy the noble Lord before I sit down that this Bill is not quite so bad a Bill as he believes it to be. The noble Lord in the course of his remarks stated that he was in favour of putting up the new licences to auction.

LORD FARRER: No. I did not ever suggest that, I think.

*EARL GREY: I understood the noble Lord to say that he thought that if the licences were put up to auction it would secure for the public purse large sums of money which the public do not now enjoy.

LORD FARRER: I am sorry to interrupt my noble friend, but what I said was that the tendency of quarter sessions would be to put up such licences to the highest bidder. I am not in favour of it personally.

*EARL GREY: I am glad the noble Lord is not in favour of such a course. I could not understand how such a remark should have come from him, because he is one of the chief supporters of the Public-House Trust movement and the chairman of the Surrey Public-House Trust Company, and he is aware, as I am aware, that if licences were put up to public auction with the result that high duties were paid by the owners of licences, there would be a very great inducement to push the sale of alcoholic liquors in order to make the money the licensee was required to pay.

With regard to the speech of the noble Viscount who moved the Amendment, no one could have listened to that speech without being powerfully impressed with the sincerity of the noble Viscount's conviction that the public well-being demanded a great reduction in the number of licences. It is true that the national consumption of alcoholic liquors is very great. It has been computed that the average consumption per head in the United Kingdom is twice that in the United States, and that if we could bring down the consumption of alcoholic liquor in the United Kingdom to the level which exists in the United States there would be a saving of £80,000,000 per annum, which, if paid to the National Exchequer, would give us a sum capitalised at thirty-three years amounting to over £2,640,000,000, or more than three times the amount of the National Debt. But that would not be the only saving to the country. There would be the still greater saving represented by the improved health, the increased efficiency, and the greater collective vigour of the nation.

I believe we are all agreed that it is most desirable that the national consumption of alcoholic liquors should be reduced. The whole question is as to what steps we should take to bring about that reduction. The view of the Government and of the noble Viscount is that the best and shortest way to bring about a reduction in the consumption of alcoholic liquors is to reduce the number of licensed houses. My noble friend who moved the Amendment said that the reduction of the licensed houses to the extent of one-half was the ideal at which we should aim. But the most rev. Primate pointed out that the connection between the amount of alcoholic liquors consumed and the number of licensed houses was by no means proved, and Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell, in the publication which doubtless most of your Lordships have had an opportunity of perusing, have pointed out that the number of licences reduced in ratio to the population during the last twenty years has been 19 per cent., but that the consumption of alcoholic liquor per head of the population during the same period instead of being reduced has actually increased by 12 per cent. That fact goes to show that there is no connection between the number of houses and the amount of liquor consumed. I am one of those who believe that the management of public-houses has more to say to the national consumption of drink than the number of houses themselves. I think we are nearly all of the opinion that the public-house is a necessity to the working man. If we once recognise that, it should be our object to make the public-house as respectable as possible and as free as possible from the deteriorating influences which are now connected with it. I do not think it is necessary for me to prove that a public-house of some sort is a necessity to the working classes of the country. I will take your Lordships, for instance, who have the opportunity of living in large houses. Notwithstanding the charm of the society which you meet in those houses, I will undertake to say that there is hardly a Member of your Lordships' house who does not seek the seclusion of the smoking-room with very great frequency. The public-house is the smoking-room of the working man, and, recognising that, we have to make the public-house a fit place for him to go to. The present system of management is responsible, in my opinion, for the excessive consumption of alcoholic liquors.

There are three evils connected with the present public-houses which ought to be remedied. The first is that from 70 to 80 per cent. of the houses are tied houses. The second evil is that it is not only the interest but the duty of the manager of the ordinary public-house to push the sale of alcoholic liquors. The third evil is that the profits which result from the fact that the house has a monopoly, instead of going into the pockets of the community to whom they belong, are diverted into the pockets of private individuals. I maintain that it is the duty of the State to protect its citizens against these evils. If the State establishes in a new district a monopoly house, I think it is bound to secure to the inhabitants of that district, who can go nowhere else but to that house for the liquors they require, the certainty of being able to obtain the best liquors that are obtainable. The State would be unfaithful to its trust if it allowed a monopoly house to be tied to any particular firm of brewers or distillers, however eminent. I am of opinion that the liquor supplied by tied houses is, as a rule, good liquor, but where a brewery or distillery has the ownership of tied houses it is only natural, if they have a bad brew, that instead of throwing it down the gutter as they ought to do, they should take the opportunity of selling it to the frequenters of their tied houses if they can safely do so. It is also the duty of the State not only to secure to the inhabitants of the district that the liquors obtained from a monopoly house are the best obtainable in the open market, but also to ensure, in the interest of temperance and of the general well-being of the locality, that the monopoly house shall be brought under a management which is under no inducement whatsoever to push the sale of alcoholic liquors. At present it is the interest and duty of the manager of a tied house to push the sale of alcoholic liquors.

The Prime Minister said the other day that he did not hold that the blame for excessive drinking was to be laid at the door of the manager of the public-house, but that the man who consumed the liquor was principally to blame. There is a certain truth in that statement, but there is also great truth in the assertion that if it is to the interest of a publican to push the sale of alcoholic liquors, there will be much more alcoholic liquor consumed in that house than would be the case it there were in charge a man who had no interest whatsoever in pushing the sale of intoxicants. I cannot impress this upon your Lordships more forcibly than by repeating a statement made to me by a publican who informed me that he was one of the most ardent advocates of the public-house trust movement. He went on to say that I should be surprised when he informed me that he was the owner of a public-house, and, he continued, "Do you think I am connected with this business because I like it? I hate it. I am a publican because I am an employer of labour." He then went on to point out that in every village in the United Kingdom there were a certain number of men, and probably the most manly, energetic, amiable, and lovable members of the community, who had to be protected againt the defects of their own virtues. He said—

"If you have behind the bar a man whose interest it is to press the sale of alcoholic liquors, these men will very likely become drunkards. But if you have behind the bar a man who, without being patronising in any way, uses his influence to prevent these men from drinking more than is good for them you will do much. If your public-house trust movement does nothing more than put behind the bars men who will take sufficient pains to ascertain the characters of the people who come to their houses, and to help the weak men when they require a helping hand, your movement will be one of the greatest blessings to all employers and working men.

The experience of our public-house trust movement has proved that, when a public-house is conducted as a refreshment room and not as a mere drinking bar, when food and non-intoxicants are served as readily as beer and spirits, when food and drink of the best quality only are served, when managers are paid a fixed salary and have no interest whatsoever in pressing the sale of alcoholic liquors, when they are encouraged to promote the sale of non-intoxicants, when you have a system of management under which no man is obliged to drink for the good of the house, when men feel that they can enjoy the society of a public-house being without called upon to buy alcoholic liquors, the result is a considerable diminution in the sale of alcoholic drink. I need not quote to your Lordships much evidence upon this point, but I may give a few instances. In connection with one hotel a report has been issued showing that before the installation of public-house trust management in March last, the management pressed the sale of alcoholic drink, a trade which gives less trouble and more profit, the non-alcoholic trade gave only a few pence per day, whereas it now often reaches £3 a day. There is another case in a neighbouring county where the manager considers it to be his duty to wean working men from excessive drinking habits. It is rereported that working men come now for tea and other non-alcoholic drinks. There is a certain moral cowardice which prevents them from asking for non-alcoholic drinks when the bar is full, but they do so more often when they are alone, and the practice will naturally be more followed when they get more supporters. There is also the story of the drayman of a brewers' firm watching his horse and cart from the doorstep of a public-house, drinking a cup of coffee instead of a glass of alcoholic liquor. Another hotel near Leeds reports that working men drop in constantly for a pint of tea or coffee instead of beer. Lord Farrer recently stated how in one of his own houses under the Surrey Public-House Trust Company for the first four weeks after they took over the house the total takings were £127, but for the last four weeks before his speech to the shareholders they were £214. At first the proportion of alcoholic liquor to non-alcoholic was 60 per cent. against 40 per cent., while in the second case, although the sum was larger the proportions were 42 per cent. of alcoholic liquors and 58 per cent. of non-alcoholic. Then there is the case of a Hertfordshire public-house called the "Waggon and Horses," where the sale of non-alcoholic liquors has reached 68 per cent. of the total takings. These facts show that under disinterested management there is a tendency to reduce the consumption of alcoholic liquors.

Earl Grey.

As to the third great evil associated with the present management of public-houses, viz., that the special profits resulting from monopoly rights go into the pockets of individuals instead of being secured for the State, according to Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell, whose figures have never yet been challenged, the net profits realised from the public-houses in the United Kingdom amounted for 1899 to the huge total of £19,400,000, and it must be recollected that from 70 to 80 per cent. of the houses are tied houses from which the brewers would secure a large profit in addition to this £19,400,000. From that the House will realise how vast are the profits connected with the public-houses of the country.

I think I have shown that it is the duty of the State in all houses, both new and existing, to provide that, whenever possible, a management shall be established which will secure to frequenters of those houses the certain knowledge that they will be served with the best liquors only, a management under which there will be no inducement to push the sale of alcoholic liquors, and further, that the monopoly values shall be secured to the public instead of going to a private and privileged class. These three advantages can be secured only in proportion as you apply the principle of disinterested management to the public-houses. I am most grateful to His Majesty's

Government for having introduced a Bill which provides machinery which will enable the principle of disinterested management to be applied not only to new houses but to existing houses also. Clause 4 acknowledges that it is obligatory upon licensing authorities to bring every new licence they create under management which will secure for the public the special profits of a monopoly trade. That is one great advantage which we shall obtain from the passage of this Bill. But I also entertain the hope that not only will this Bill secure the benefit of disinterested management in new houses, but that it will also provide the machinery which will enable us to secure the application of disinterested principles to existing houses.

Under this Bill, as I understand it, the licensing authorities will be empowered practically to transfer licences from the trade to the trust. I will explain how I think that will be done. In a certain village with which I am acquainted there are two public-houses, one belonging to a trust company and the other to the trade. It is a mining village, and, as your Lordships are aware, on pay Fridays miners consume far too large a proportion of their wages in drink. If both houses in this mining village were under trust management, nothing would be easier than for the people responsible for the management of the houses to close them earlier on pay nights, or to withdraw spirits from the bar, or to adopt any other temperance regulations which might be approved and which might respond to the progressive temperance sentiment of the locality. But it is impossible to do that at present. If the trust house were to refuse to serve alcoholic liquor an hour before the legal closing time, it would not reduce the consumption of drink at all. The only result would be that the trade of the trust house would go to the house belonging to the trade. But suppose the trust company could go to the licensing authorities and say, "In the interests of temperance and of the general well-being of the locality we want to secure for trust management this house which is now run on ordinary trade principles. We will give you the statutory compensation which you will have to give to the licensee if you refuse to renew his licence." If the licensing authority agree with the managers of the trust, there is nothing in the Bill to prevent them from refusing to renew the licence belonging to the trade, and creating at the same time a new licence in favour of the trust company. If that can be done, and I believe it can be under the Bill, you will have the machinery provided for which we have all longed since Mr. Chamberlain tried to municipalise the public-houses in 1877. We shall have the machinery provided which will enable us gradually to deal with entire districts.

The whole question is, Will it be possible for us to do it? Will the price we should have to pay for compensation to the trade house, the renewal of whose licence is refused, be so large as to make the operation impossible? That entirely dedends upon the compensation clauses. I confess that I am much disappointed with that part of the Bill which deals with compensation as it has come up from the House of Commons. I preferred it in its original form. The compensation to be given to existing licences was to be the compensation to which they would be entitled on the value calculated as if this Act had not passed. Certain words have now been introduced into the Bill which show that that is not to be the case. In its present form the publican is entitled to the full value of the unearned increment which his house may enjoy from the suppression of competing and redundant houses in his neighbourhood. That, I think, is perfectly opposed to the whole principle and spirit of the Bill. You have, by your Bill, provided that the monopoly value resulting from new licences shall be secured to the public. If you once take up that position are you not bound to take such steps as may be necessary to secure the increased monopoly value which existing houses will enjoy, because you have suppressed under this Bill the houses with which they compete? Are you not bound to secure that that monopoly value shall be appropriated also to the public? It is my intention in Committee to move an Amendment which will make this quite clear, and provide that when compensation is given to existing houses whose licences are renewable upon grounds other than misconduct, the measure of compensation shall be the value attaching to the licences at the time of the passing of this Act. If such an Amendment is not inserted, although I have hitherto been an opponent of a time limit, I must say that unless you introduce some provision which will secure to the public that increase in the monopoly value which all existing houses, will enjoy after the neighbouring houses are suppressed—unless you put in provisions that will effect that purpose, then I shall certainly be bound to support the Amendment of which notice has been given by the most rev. Primate. I trust His Majesty's Government may see their way to incorporate such an Amendment in the Bill. I am one of those who think that this Bill, with Amendments of that character, may be justly regarded as a great temperance measure on the grounds which I have endeavoured, very imperfectly I admit, to explain to your Lordships. I support this measure on the ground that you will by this Bill secure the application of the principle of disinterested management to all new houses, and because this Bill will also provide the machinery by means of which you will be able to Gothenburg entire districts.

The LORD PRIVY SEAL (The **Marquess of Salisbury**): The noble Earl in the speech he has just delivered has touched upon what is to all of us a most interesting experiment with which his own name has been associated. I can assure him that there is nothing in the Bill which is in the least inconsistent with what he has said upon that branch of the subject. I think he has rightly said that it will be perfectly open to quarter sessions to grant facilities to the trust of which the noble Earl speaks. I believe that, by the method which he has described, it would be possible, provided he could convince quarter sessions that his claim was a good one, for them to transfer the exercise of a licence in a particular locality from the trade to one of the houses under his control. The only conditions which are necessary is that adequate compensation should be provided, and that the noble Earl's trust should be under the condition to surrender the monopoly value of the trade to the public. At an earlier period of this afternoon a most eloquent and earnest speech was delivered by the noble Viscount, to which I am certain all your Lordships listened with the greatest interest. While I was listening to that speech I could not but remember that on the last occasion upon which I addressed him I should not have dared to have criticised anything he had said, but I hope that the great respect with which I then treated him may still linger about my words, and that nothing I shall say in the course of the few observations I am addressing to your Lordships this evening will derogate from that standard which I hope I have set up for myself. But, my Lords, it was, if I may say so, the earnestness of the noble Viscount which frightened me. He spoke of the evils of drink, and we all agree with him in that. The evils of drink are patent and undeniable. He spoke of the unanimous feeling that something should be done. It has often been said, and it cannot too often be repeated, that that is always a formidable statement, but one always has the natural terror lest the zeal of good men may do grave injustice when carried forward upon the wave of an earnest and popular feeling such as the noble Viscount has described. He tried to enlist upon his side, with the consummate skill of an old Parliamentary hand, all those bodies of men in this country who are by temperament and profession attached to philanthropy. He appealed to this Bench and to the right rev. Prelates who sit upon these Benches, and he said, if I am not putting an unfair gloss upon his words: "Are you going to be behind other religious bodies; you, the Church of England, are you going to allow the Nonconformists to be first in temperance reform; you who are competitors for popular approval in these great works of charity, are you going to be behind those with whom you are in competition." My Lords, I think the temptation is a very dangerous one even for the right rev. Prelates, and it was apparent, and I say it with great respect, that the appeal which the noble Viscount had made was not without a certain effect upon the most rev. Primate who followed him. He spoke in the name of the Church of England, and he told us how recently in Convocation he stood at the head of a united body of Prelates in criticising and condemning one of the main provisions of this Bill. Yes, my Lords, I observe that he confined himself to Prelates, but the Church of England does not consist entirely of Prelates. I cannot forget a certain great meeting of the representative Church Council in which these issues were submitted. I think the most rev. Prelate did say that the laity of the Church of England, as there represented, did not quite agree with their decision. But it was not only a matter of the laity. What about the clergy? After the decisions to which that great council came it is impossible to say that the Church of England has condemned this Bill, or has at all insisted that a time limit should be included in it. The truth is, my Lords, that when the noble Viscount speaks of the strong public feeling against public-houses, and when other noble Lords remind us of the awful evils of intemperance—as Lord Shuttleworth, for example, did—the only conclusion which you would draw from these observations is that the trade in drink is utterly bad and that the people of this country repudiate it. But neither proposition is true. The trade in drink is not bad but good. It is a necessity for the people and it is also a luxury. It is a luxury even to noble Lords, which all of them, or nearly all of them, avail themselves of, and which they are certainly not entitled to deny in the case of their poorer fellow-citizens. Public-houses are not always employed in giving more drink than is good for people to those who are already drunk; on the contrary their usual trade is to suply a very legitimate and a very necessary want to the people, and therefore they are entitled to every justice which a reasonable and fair trade is entitled to at the hands of your Lordships' House.

The noble Viscount, however, would not have our Bill at any price, he said it deprived the magistrates in petty sessions of most of their power. He said that the possibility of a suppression of redundant houses under it was absurdly small, and that it was founded upon no intelligible principle. He further asserted that quarter sessions would not know how to estimate the value of public-houses, and, in fact, he seemed to condemn the Bill thoroughly. But, my Lords, I deny every one of those propositions. When the noble Lord and others say that the powers of the magistrates in petty sessions are cribbed, cabined, and confined by this Bill, what do they mean? In the first place we do not attack, we do not assail, and we do not diminish in the least degree the ordinary jurisdiction of petty sessions by which they can endorse or suppress a licence, the holder of which is convicted before them for misconduct. That is their main duty, and that is left absolutely untouched by this Bill. But even in regard to redundant houses how does the case stand? The truth is by giving the magistrates through the combined actions of petty sessions and quarter sessions power to give compensation, the Bill does not diminish but increases their power for getting rid of redundant houses. Now, my Lords, I will give authority for that argument. I have read with some interest the Report of the Royal Commission—I allude to the Minority Report—and I find on page 118 of that Report that this observation is made; it is a description of the practice of licensing justices under the present law—

> "They have the power of refusing the renewal of a licence howe er old, although they do not exercise the power at all largely. They are rathe restr cted from acting as they would otherwise do from the fear of inflicting an injury, either on the tenant or on the owner of the property."

That is the justification for compensation under this Bill. It is because the magistrates in hundreds of cases are, like your Lordships, so much impressed with the injustice of destroying a man's means of livelihood without giving him compensation, that they have not acted, and when the noble Viscount and others point to extreme cases like the case of Portsmouth, in which very few licences have been suspended or suppressed, does it not occur to them that the probable reason of the inaction of the magistrates has not been because they had no power under the present law, but because they were unable to grant compensation, and this has caused them to shrink from the injustice of destroying the publican's livelihood. I am afraid that I am bound to say that this strong opinion, and this strong appreciation of the value of magistrates in petty sessions is of rather recent growth in the mind of the noble Viscount and his friends, because I notice also in the Minority Report that they announce this conclusion—

> "After a very careful and exhaustive review of the administration of the law by the justices, we are forced to the conclusion that the licensing business cannot be properly left solely in their hands."

I am quite aware that in those days the noble Viscount thought the magistrates were too much inclined to be on the publican's side, but now he thinks that in certain localities they are inclined to work hard for the temperance reformers, and upon that ground he has changed his opinion. I must say that I think he is bound by the words of this Report, and this immense appreciation of the value of petty sessions seems to me to be of a suspiciously late growth in the noble Lord's mind. Then he went on to say that the number of redundant licences which could be put an end to under our Bill was absurdly small. I confess that I think a measure which puts £1,250,000 every year at the disposal of the various quarter sessions of this country in order to suppress, with due compensation, licences, is not a contemptible matter at all. My noble friend who spoke on behalf of the Government earlier this afternoon told your Lordships that he had calculated that, at any rate to begin with, when we were dealing with the small, cheap, and worst public-houses, very nearly 2,500 of them could be dealt with each year. How many redundant licences does the noble Viscount suppose are being dealt with now in one year? Why the highest number which has been dealt with in any year—the highest number of redundant licences suppressed in any one year has, up to now, only been 200. Under this Bill we propose to change that possible and occasional 200 into a constant number of 2,500, which I think your Lordships will admit is an enormous change in the direction of suppressing those licensed houses which ought to be suppressed.

With regard to the principle I should have thought our principle was most intelligible, because the principle of our compensation is to award the difference between the value of the licensed house with the licence and the licensed house without the licence. That appears to me not only a common-sense principle, but a principle dictated by the most elementary principles of honesty. I may just mention the last point made by the noble Viscount in which he said that quarter sessions were quite unfit to decide questions of value. Why, my Lords, they have to do it every day. I am speaking to your Lordships, who are all, no doubt, in your own persons justices, and many of you are chairmen of quarter sessions, and you are all aware that some of the most intricate matters which any tribunal has to decide is the question of the value of property for rating purposes, and these questions come every day before quarter sessions. There is nothing in this Bill which I think will affect that question, and no one has called into question the competence of quarter sessions to deal with matters of this description. The noble Viscount was very critical of our compensation scheme, in regard to which I shall have something to say directly. In the first place, he was very critical of it because he said that it would confer a freehold upon the licensee.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: I said a permanent interest.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: It is perfectly true that he used the word "permanent interest," but I think I am not misquoting him when I say that he used the word "freehold" in this connection.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: No, I did not.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am informed that it was Lord Shuttleworth who used the term "freehold." I do not quite know what noble Lords mean when they say that we are conferring or recognising by this Bill that the licence is a freehold. It is part of the Government case that the licensee has certain equitable rights which have a money value, and if you take away those rights though there is no fault on the part of the licensee you are bound to compensate him. But that does not mean turning the licence into a freehold. What I conceive such a phrase as that would imply would be that we should secure to the licensee an income equivalent to the income he had been earning as a publican for all time. I can assure noble Lords that the basis of compensation upon which our Bill is drawn does not mean anything of the kind. In the first place it ought not to involve anything of the kind, because there is the uncertainty of the trade. There are, moreover, all sorts of possibilities which may happen to a publican, he may be guilty of misconduct, or he may be unfit to hold a licence. Those are reasons which would involve the loss of his licence, as noble Lords are aware, both under the present law and under the Bill which is now submitted to your Lordships. All these things must affect, and other causes must affect, the value of the interest which we compensate. But how are you to determine this? There is no way of determining it except the way the Government have adopted, and that is to estimate the difference in the value of the licensed house with the licence, and the licensed house without the licence. That will take into account all those limitations to which I have called your Lordships' attention, and the result of it will be precisely that, and no more, which the licensee and persons interested in the licence are entitled to if the licence is suppressed.

Now, my Lords, one of the most striking parts of the noble Viscount's speech was the passage in which he repeated what his own hopes and expectations had been. I am not quoting his own words, for I have not the eloquence to do so, but he said that he had looked forward to the suppression of something like 50 per cent. of the licences of this country. I frankly admit that that is not what the Government desire, and they do not intend anything of the kind. Let us consider for a moment this question. I think that for this purpose you may divide licences which ought to be suppressed, or are capable of being suppressed, into three categories. There are those in which the licensees are guilty of a distinct breach of the conditions upon which they hold the licences. That case is one which this Bill does not alter in the least. Under the present law they can be suppressed without compensation, and under this Bill, if it becomes law, such licences will be liable to suppression at the discretion of the magistrates without compensation in case of a distinct breach of the conditions upon which the licence is granted. Then there are licences which ought to be suppressed in the public interest, but in respect of which the licensee has been guilty of no fault at all. Those are the licences with which this Bill deals, and those may be suppressed upon proper conditions. Lastly there are the licences which ought really not to be suppressed in the public interest at all, but which certain eccentric benches of magistrates think ought to be suppressed, these certainly ought not to be suppressed without compensation, and in our opinion ought not to be suppressed at all. Of course there is nothing in the Government Bill which would render their suppression any easier; on the contrary, both by the limitations and the sum of money which is available, and by referring the matter from the local bench to quarter sessions, we take precautions to prevent the suppression of licences which really ought not to be suppressed at all, and which are not required to be suppressed in the public interest, but which are exposed to the danger of being suppressed owing to the particular views, and what I venture to call the eccentric views, of particular benches of magistrates in particular parts of the country. It is true that they are not very many, and it is not a very common case to find a bench of magistrates deviating from the ordinary rule; but such has been the case to so important an extent that this measure has been called for.

I therefore turn to the licences which ought to be suppressed in the public interest, but inasmuch as the licensee has committed no fault that suppression should only be carried out upon proper terms. I think it is almost common ground amongst all your Lordships, and indeed amongst all reasonable men, that the holders of such licences are entitled to compensation. I hardly like to trouble your Lordships at this late hour with very elaborate reasons, but any of you who are familiar with the provisions of the licensing law will recognise that what has been called "the expectation of renewal" which these licensees possess has been thoroughly well founded. I will just recite them, and I will allude to provisions in the law which show that the Legislature has always treated renewals as being upon a totally different footing to new licences. [Cries of "No, no!"] Well, I am going to prove my statement. I say that the Legislature has always treated renewals upon a totally separate footing, and has therefore given very good ground for the expectation of renewal which existed practically undisputed until the celebrated case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" arose. ["No."] The noble Lord does not agree with me, but I will give him one or two instances. There are, of course, the instances which have already been cited, and I do not intend to dwell upon them because they have already been dealt with. There is the case in which under the present law any licensed house which is compulsorily expropriated for a public improvement is compensated at its full value. There is the instance of the death duties which are charged on the full value of licensed premises; then again there are many statutory distinctions between the case of renewals and the case of new licences. Any objection, for example, to a renewal has to be an objection on oath, and this distinguishes it from the objection to a new licence. There is in the case of a renewal which is refused an appeal to quarter sessions which is not provided for in the case of a new licence. There is also the provision that where an existing licensee's licence is objected to his attendance is not requisite unless he be specially summoned. Here again there is a distinction between that and the case of a new licence. An objection has to be given in writing in the case of the renewal of an old licence, and the Legislature expressly lays it down that the onus of proof lies upon the objector. Lastly, the interests of owner himself as distinguished from the publican are specially protected by the law, showing that in that respect the old licence which comes up for renewal is upon a different footing to a new licence.

I have said, therefore, that practically all parties recognise that this expectation, this legitimate expectation of renewal, deserves compensation if the licensee is, through no fault of his own, turned out. And, my Lords, that is not only the view

The Marquess of Salisbury.

of the Government, but, as the noble Viscount has admitted, it was the view of the minority of the Commission. The noble Viscount himself, speaking tonight, admitted that a licence under these circumstances would have an equitable right to compensation. Mark the word "equitable" because in an eloquent speech made the other night in another place it was found advisable to try and explain away the word equitable, and it was said that it was not a question of equity, but one of expediency. But the noble Viscount, perhaps, has been more candid than the speaker to whom I am referring, for he admitted that there was an equitable right, but he subjected it to a most wonderful condition. The noble Viscount did not admit that there was any equity which demanded compensation unless a very large number of licensed houses were suppressed — unless, I think he said, half the public-houses were suppressed. Up to that moment, although I could not agree with him, I had followed him very carefully and sympathised with him, but I confess that I was completely beaten by that proposition. Why it should be necessary in point of equity to compensate a large number of licensees, and not equitable and not necessary to compensate a small number, I cannot conceive. If only one or two publicans are deprived of their livelihood they are to receive nothing, whilst if a large number of publicans are treated in the same way they are to receive substantial compensation. That seems to me to be a proposition wholly incapable of justification. Not only did the noble Viscount admit the equity in his speech to-day, but he delivered a speech at one period of his career in which he stated in very remarkable and strong terms how inequitable it was to take away licences from those who were not in fault without compensation, and I will, if he will allow me, read a short passage from a speech which he made in the House of Commons in the year 1879. He was then answering the hon. Baronet Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and he said—

> "If he had said it excluded compensation, I certainly should not have given him my support."

The noble Viscount was then speaking to a Motion in favour of what was called at that time the Permissive Bill. In the same speech he went on to say—

> "Compensation must be given in all cases where a house is closed on public grounds, and where the licensee has committed no breach of the law. To reduce the number of licences in such cases without compensation would be a violation of the rights of property and confiscation in the worst sense of the term."

That was the view of the noble Viscount not so very long ago—in the year 1879—and I think it was a recollection of those observations which was perhaps floating in his mind which induced him to tell your Lordships to-day that the suppression of licences without compensation where the licensees were not in fault was inequitable.

I noticed that when I mentioned the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" just now, the noble and learned Lord opposite evidently signified disapproval of my statement that that case demolished the case for legitimate expectation of renewal. I am not qualified to discuss with anybody, and much less qualified to discuss with the noble and learned Lord opposite, a matter of law, but I will remind him and your Lordships' House that up to the decision in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" practically speaking, there was only one opinion throughout the country upon this point, and that opinion was, that it was not the duty of magistrates to suppress any licence unless the licensee had been guilty of misconduct, or unless he had committed some breach of the conditions of his licence. That state of things is very well known to your Lordships. That being the case up to "Sharp *v.* Wakefield," it practically settles the matter, because the number of licences which have been granted since 'Sharp *v.* Wakefield" are exceedingly small. I do not think there are more than 5 per cent. of all the existing licences at the present day which have been granted since the decision of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield," so that of all the licences with which we have to deal 95 per cent. were granted in the days when this legitimate expectation of renewal was in existence, and when neither the magistrates who granted them nor the licensees who held them could have had the least idea that the tenure upon which the licences were granted was such as to render them liable to suppression otherwise than by some breach of the conditions upon which they were granted,

I think noble Lords will agree that I have established my point that compensation of some kind is due to a licensee whose licence is suppressed if he himself has been in no wise in fault. I am quite aware that noble Lords opposite and the noble Viscount himself, while they admit that some kind of compensation is necessary, consider that our kind of compensation is the wrong kind, and that they think what we ought to provide is a time limit. I notice that it is not suggested now, although I think it was suggested when these discussions first began, that a time limit should be substituted for the provision dealing with compensation which is contained in this Bill. I think the reason is that it has become apparent to those who made that suggestion that a time limit would suspend the process of getting rid of redundant licences during the operation of that time limit, and as they were not prepared to face that conclusion they abandoned that proposal. The proposal which is now made is that our plan for imposing charges upon the trade and for paying compensation for these houses should be allowed to continue for a certain number of years, at the end of which period these houses should be liable to suppression without any compensation at all. What I want to impress upon your Lordships is that the security dependent upon the compensation which is afforded to these houses during the period of the time limit is not a gift at all to the trade. It has been said any number of times that the plan proposed by the Government is a plan of compulsory insurance. The trade have to pay the full value of the insurance, and every halfpenny which goes into the publicans' pockets or the pockets of the brewer or the landowner under this Bill comes out of the trade. Therefore it is in no sense a gift to the trade, and at the end of that period you are precisely in the same position you are now. During that period a system of insurance has continued, which insurance has been fully paid for, and nothing has been given to the liquor trade at all. They have paid every halfpenny of it, and at the end of that time if you take away that which, as we contend, belongs to them, and which is not the freehold but a certain right dependent upon the legitimate expectation of renewal, if you take that away it will be absolute and sheer confiscation to do so without compensation. Nothing that you have done in the meantime can avail you, because you have given nothing and you have done nothing except to sell a certain insurance to the trade which you have been fully paid for, and therefore at the end of the period if you take away the licence you will have given nothing for it. When I say that you will have given nothing for it, I admit that you will have given a certain notice that at the end of the period you will proceed in the fashion which I have described. That notice, as I venture to contend, is by no means a sufficient *quid pro quo* for destroying the livelihood of the publican, and for destroying the value of the interest which other parties have in the licence. The noble Viscount says that at the end of that period surely the publican can insure himself. I am not at all sure that he would be able to insure himself upon any reasonable terms, for he would be in a condition of complete uncertainty. He will know that under the conditions in which he is placed he may be the victim of every passing phase of public opinion, and he may also be unfortunate enough to live within the jurisdiction of some authority whose views are very extreme upon temperance questions. Supposing, my Lords, if I may say so, the chairman of the quarter sessions or of the borough magistrates, as it would be in the case of a county borough, was the noble Viscount himself. What would the publican have to expect? He would know that in the noble Viscount's opinion 50 per cent. of the licences ought to be suppressed. Upon what reasonable conditions could a man insure himself in the face of that possibility? Does the noble Viscount not see that by the extremity of his own views he absolutely destroys the possibility of insurance and, as a matter of fact, the publican would find that it was ruinous to insure himself and he would probably do what any of your Lordships would do under the same circumstances, that is, he would take his chance, and if he fell under the condemnation of the noble Viscount, then he would be ruined, and his ruin, if your Lordships were unwise enough to agree to the Amendment which the noble Lord favours, would be laid at the door of your Lordships' own consciences. No, my Lords, depend upon it the time limit is not a feasible plan. It is neither just when you come to examine it in detail in its operation, nor is it likely to work easily or well.

The Marquess of Salisbury.

I may remind your Lordships of one or two other points in this connection, and they have already been mentioned in this debate. Undoubtedly at the end of the time limit, whenever that was approaching, there would be uncertainty, and such uncertainty in the minds of the publicans, that the magistrates would lose the control they now possess over their conduct. They would know that the time during which their security lasted was so short that it would not be worth while to behave with the same propriety as they had done hitherto. And, my Lord, the justices themselves if they were fair-minded justices, as most of them are, would also realise when the time limit came to an end that they were deprived of the power of giving compensation, and therefore all the arguments which I have already addressed to your Lordships would apply, and they would shrink from ruining a poor man whose licence was objected to although he himself was not in fault. The consequence would be that the whole process of your temperance effort for the suppression of redundant licences which, in the case I am contemplating, magistrates properly incline to, would be entirely suspended.

Lastly, your Lordships should recollect what would happen in the case of the ante-1869 beerhouses. No temperance reformers in their wildest moments—and they have some wild moments—have ever called into question the goodness of the title of the ante-1869 beerhouses, and this is the first legislation which has been proposed with any chance of being carried which will deal with these ante-1869 beerhouses, and which will deal with them fairly. They have a better title than the other public-houses, and that better title will be represented in the amount of compensation they will receive. These licences will be more valuable and a larger measure of compensation will be due to them. Therefore, dealing with the ante-1869 beerhouses is perfectly possible and consistent with the ordinary principles which will govern our legislation if this Bill becomes law. Let us suppose that there was a time limit. At the end of the time limit the ante-1869 beerhouses would, of course, resume the full value of their complete and indefeasible Parliamentary title which we desire should henceforth be given to them, and, therefore, you could not destroy them at all, and they would have to remain. In regard to these ante-1869 beerhouses, which are, recollect, my Lords, a third of all the licences in England, and include in their number almost all the worst houses in England—if they are not dealt with in the period before the time limit expires they will resume their complete security which this Government is doing its best to take from them in order to deal with that most difficult and yet most urgent part of temperance reform. All that would be completely destroyed by the proposal to create a time limit which finds favour with the most rev. Primate and with the noble Lord opposite.

I think I have said enough to your Lordships to show why it is that the Government recommend this Bill to Parliament. I think the noble Viscount and the most rev. Primate did suggest to us a time limit, but I think there was an uneasy consciousness about both their suggestions that the proposal was not altogether a sound one, and I think they both said that, at any rate, if any difficulty did arise at the end of their time limit, whether it was fourteen years or twenty-one years, then Parliament could take the necessary measures to prevent injustice. The noble Viscount said that he thought even then the unfortunate licensee might in certain cases be the victim of great hardships if he were turned out, and he said Parliament would take that into consideration when the time came. That is a very fair conclusion, and I, to some extent, re-echo it. If any difficulty takes place at the end of fourteen or twenty-one years, then let Parliament take the necessary steps. That is precisely what the Government say. We do not deprive Parliament, and we have no power to deprive a future Parliament, of the right of dealing with this question as they may think fit, but what we say is that as far as we can see with the facts before us, our Bill contains within itself provisions which will put an end to redundant houses without injustice, and we will not anticipate what may be provided fourteen or twenty years hence in order to complete the work that we are beginning. We recommend this Bill to your Lordships because we believe it is founded on the principles of justice, we support it because we think it is the most hopeful temperance measure ever presented to Parliament, and for these reasons we call upon your Lordships, without mutilating the measure, to pass it into law.

*LORD DAVEY: Some of the statements made by the noble Lord who has just sat down appear to me so widely different from the actual facts of the case that I think I ought to say a few words upon this question. The noble Marquess said, if I understood him rightly, that before the decision in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" everybody was of opinion that the renewal of a licence could not be refused except for cause shown. That seems to me to be a very bold statement indeed. The noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill has improved upon that because he said that previous to that decision magistrates believed that they had no option except to renew licences, and that the magistrates had been misrepresenting to the brewers or the publicans what their powers were. Now, my Lords, that seems to me a very serious statement. I am not prepared to endorse the language which both the noble Marquess and the noble Lord opposite have used in regard to the magistrates and those who advise them. I cannot believe that all of them held that opinion, and I know some who were not of that opinion. I have no doubt that any person who took the trouble to look at the sections of the Act under which licences are granted and renewed could not for one moment have entertained that opinion. What a person who did not take the trouble to look at this section of the Act under which he was acting would do, I cannot say, but it is absolutely impossible that anybody could have read the Act under which the power of renewal is exercised and believe that he had no option except to renew the licence. I will venture to remind your Lordships of the words of that Act. It is the Alehouse Act of 1828, Section 13, and it provides as follows—

> "Every licence which shall be granted shall be in force for one whole year and no longer."

There can be no doubt about the meaning of those words. My noble friend seems to think that the decision in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" fell like a bolt from the blue. I do not know what the Lord Chancellor would say upon that point. I think noble Lords will find it very difficult to quote any judicial or non-judicial authorities to the effect that magistrates had no option except to renew a licence. I think that it is a bold assertion, in defiance of the express terms of the Act itself, to make such a statement. Of course persons' rights are not determined by what persons who do not choose to look at the Act of Parliament which gives the right may have thought or not thought, but they are determined by the words of the Act of Parliament itself, and I presume that every person who took a licence knew, or must be taken to have known, that he took it for one year and no longer, and that the magistrates had the absolute discretion whether they would renew it or not. I have not had the opportunity during the noble Marquess's speech to look into the details of the procedure, which I have not present in my mind, but it may be that there is some difference in the details of the procedure. There is no doubt that there is an appeal from a refusal to renew to quarter sessions, and I believe there is no appeal—I am speaking from memory only, but the noble Marquess has no doubt looked into it—from a refusal to grant a new licence.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: There is no appeal to quarter sessions in the case of a new licence. A new licence has to be confirmed, but not by quarter sessions.

* LORD DAVEY: I am then right in thinking that there is no appeal to quarter sessions from a refusal to grant a new licence, whereas there is an appeal from a refusal to renew a licence. Of course there is this difference in the procedure, but the fact remains, and that is the important fact that the magistrates in brewster sessions have precisely the same discretion and, to use the language of Lord Justice Fry in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield," ought to have regard to precisely the same considerations in renewing a licence as they have in granting a fresh licence. The learned Judge quotes there a case in which the considerations on which the discretion of the magistrates in the case of granting a new licence should be exercised had been laid down by Lord Justice Lush, and says that the same considerations should govern their discretion on an application for renewal of a licence. To say that people's rights are to be regulated by what ignorant people may have thought in the face of the exact terms of the Act of Parliament to which I have referred, seems to me to be rather trifling with the law. Speaking for myself, I cannot make a statement which seems to be so libellous on the magistrates, who, in my experience, I have found administer the law with great care, or upon their clerks or others who advise them, and so far as my experience of that work goes are usually very careful in the advice they give to magistrates. I do not believe that any magistrate or the clerk of any magistrate ever believed that the magistrates had no option in regard to renewing a licence.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I believe it.

* LORD DAVEY: Then I will say that I do not believe that any magistrate who ever took the trouble to look at the Act of Parliament which he was administering ever believed it. I am perfectly certain that no judicial decision or expression of opinion can be quoted which in any way encourages the belief that magistrates had no option but to renew a licence. That being so, it has always been very difficult for me to see the force of the argument which has been put forward, because a person who accepts a licence issued under a statutory authority must be taken to have known the

statutory authority under which it was issued. There cannot be any doubt in regard to it. I well remember expressing the same opinion in the debates of the House of Commons upon Mr. Goschen's proposal, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer in the year 1890 or 1891. It has always been difficult for me to see what claim in any intelligible sense a man who has taken a licence under these circumstances can have to compensation. Holding that opinion, however, I am not averse to giving compensation, and for this reason, that I am anxious to see the number of licences, which I believe to be in most cases quite excessive, reduced. I do not think that the magistrates would be induced to reduce the number of public-houses to any extent unless they had the power of granting some compensation to the persons interested in those houses. On that ground and not on any ground of equity, because I do not think the publican has got any claim upon that ground, I think there is a case for some compensation.

If I turn to this Bill, what do I find? I find one thing which is certain, and something else which is uncertain. What is certain is that you are endowing the owners of public-houses, the owners of licensed houses, and the persons interested in licensed houses, with an absolute permanent interest in their licences. I say that after contrasting their legal position before this Act with what will be their legal position after this Act has passed. Their legal position before this Bill becomes law is that the magistrates have had in their power and in the exercise of their judicial discretion the right to refuse to renew a licence. But after this Bill is passed the magistrates will no longer have that power, except upon the terms of paying them the full value of their house, that is to say, the difference between the value of the house as an ordinary house and the value of the house as a licensed house. My noble friend below me was quite justified this afternoon in saying that this is a permanent interest with which you endow the owner of the licensed house. At the present time they have by law only a precarious interest which may or may not be renewed upon a subsequent occasion, but you are going to give the licence-holder a permanent interest which must be renewed except upon the terms of paying him the full value of his licensed house. I confess that this appears to me to be an enormous present, and an enormous endowment to the owners of licensed houses. There cannot be any doubt about it, that this Bill enormously increases the value of the licensed houses of which these people are the owners. That is what is proposed to be done by this Bill. The State confers this great benefit upon the owners of licensed houses, and you would naturally suppose that the State would get some consideration or some value in return for what they give with so lavish a hand. But, my Lords, the State gets nothing at all. The only thing the State gets which can be described as any return at all is the power of reducing the number of licences, and that is perfectly uncertain. In fact the Bill restricts the power of refusing to renew licences because quarter sessions cannot now refuse to renew a licence unless the fund provided for the purposes of compensation is sufficient for that purpose; and so the power of reducing licences is limited by the amount of the compensation fund. The noble Marquess has said that that compensation fund will reach £1,500,000, or some amount of that kind. But will it? If you look at the Bill you will find that the magistrates are not bound to raise the whole amount, and if in any particular locality they do not propose to reduce licences that money would not enure for the benefit of another locality where they wish to reduce more licences than they have money for. Each locality is limited to the amount of its own fund, and it by no means follows that they will have the whole aggregate amount of £1,500,000 at their disposal for this purpose.

Then the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill, and I think the noble Marquess rather developed the same line of argument, said that it would be inconsistent with this Bill to grant a time limit. I cannot, for the life of me, follow that argument, and I cannot see any inconsistency in it whatever. The situation is this. The publican or the owner of a licensed house is not by law entitled to any compensation whatever, but you propose for certain reasons which I think are sufficient—and I make the noble Marquess that concession, although I decline to do it on the ground of equity, because there is none in this case—but you are going to provide a fund for compensating him in certain conditions. You may say to the man who has at present no right to compensation, and is liable to have the renewal of his licence refused at the discretion of the magistrate, "You may perhaps have been misled in regard to the administration of the law, and you may have been led to believe that you were not likely to be interfered with except on certain grounds of conduct, and we will therefore give you ten years notice." I know that the most rev. Primate says twenty-one years, but I think that is rather too long. A good deal has been said by some noble Lords about the freehold which the publican has at present in the licence, but what he has at the most is only a tenancy from year to year—it is not even from year to year because no notice is required to end it at the end of the first year. You are going to alter it now to what is equivalent to a freehold, because you are proposing to give him a perpetual right of renewal unless he receives the value of his licensed house in exchange. That is what you are going to do. But why give him a preferential right of this kind, why not give him the right of renewal for ten years, and during that ten years he will know exactly where he is.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: But you do not give him that right of renewal, because you sell it to him.

*LORD DAVEY: But you tell him that t the end of ten years he will be in the position in which he is now, that is to say, that the magistrates will have a right to refuse the renewal of his licence. If a man takes a lease for ten years with the knowledge that he will have no right to renew it, he cannot be said by the most strained use of the word equity—certainly not by any use of the word with which I am familiar—to have acquired any right to the renewal of his licence. It is said that it is very hard upon the man that he should be called upon to pay his contributions, which are in the nature of premiums on insurances during those ten years, if his licence is not to be renewed, and if he is not to have the benefit of it. That seems to me to be a most fallacious argument. Have noble Lords never heard of a man insuring his life for ten years. A man frequently does that.

LORD BELPER: But when a man insures his life for ten years at the end of that time he gets a large proportion of benefit from the insurance if he lives.

*LORD DAVEY: No, that is not so. If he dies within the ten years his relatives or survivors get the money, and he pays the money as premiums for the insurance. A man who has insured his life for ten years and survives the period and lives, say, a further twenty-five years, can hardly complain that he did not get anything out of the insurance company when the contract was in case he died within a period of ten years. It appears to me that this is merely a matter of contract. If a man knows that in consideration of his getting a lease for ten years instead of being a lessee from year to year he will have to pay a certain sum per year during those ten years where is the hardship? I fail to see any hardship at all in this case. If a man makes a very good bargain like this, at the end of the ten years he will have no claim whatever for saying that he has any right to renew it. It will be within the discretion of the magistrates who will probably exercise their discretion very much in the same way as they do at the present time. But what do the Government now propose? They propose to provide a scheme of that very character. They suggest that new licences should be granted for a period not exceeding seven years and that after that time there should be no right to renewal. That is an exact parallel to the case I have mentioned. You have put this into the Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: No, no!

*LORD DAVEY: I affirm that it is an exact parallel case to what would be the operation of a time limit for ten, fourteen, or twenty-one years, and the amount of the term does not affect the principle.

At any rate the operation would be exactly the same. You would grant the existing licensee a licence for ten years on the terms that if his licence was refused at any time during those ten years, he would be compensated.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Yes, out of the funds of the trade but not out of Government money.

*LORD DAVEY: I will deal with that presently. That seems to me to be a fallacy. You grant him a licence for ten years upon the terms that if his licence is refused, except for misconduct, he will be compensated. How does that differ from the scheme proposed in the Bill for granting new licences for a term not exceeding seven years on such terms as to payment and so forth as the justices may determine. Clause 4 provides—

> "The justices of a licensing district, on the grant of a new licence, may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions, both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence, and as to any other matters . . ."

As regards that, it appears to me—noble Lords opposite will be able to show in this debate that I am wrong if it be so—but that appears to me to be an exact parallel and an exact precedent for the way in which a time limit, if inserted in this Bill, would work. Instead of converting a tenancy from year to year into what I will call, metaphorically, a freehold, you would convert it into a lease for ten, fourteen, or twenty-one years, or whatever other period was fixed, and at the end of that term the licence-holder would have notice of the conditions which the law intended him to observe as the holder of the licence for one year and no longer. Just in the same way the new licensee would get his licence for seven years, and would know at the end of that period that he would have no right to renewal. It would lie in the discretion of the magistrates whether they would renew those licences or not. The cases appear to me to be exactly parallel, and I think that the provisions inserted by the Government in their Bill with respect to new licences are an exact precedent for the proposal which has been made with regard to the insertion of the time limit in this Bill.

There is one other point. The noble Marquess said that it was the publican who paid. Of course it is, because he gets a precarious tenure converted either into a freehold or into a lease for a certain number of years. That corresponds to one of the conditions which it will be in the power of the magistrates to insert in seven-year term licences. Who ought to pay? I think the State might call upon the holder of a licence to pay some consideration for having his position so much improved. The State has a perfect right to improve his position and his *status* in the manner in which it is provided to do it under this Bill, and the State has a right to call upon him to give something for that improvement. Instead of that all we call upon him to do is to contribute towards an insurance fund for the purpose of compensating persons whose licences are refused. It is not the publican who really pays, because he pays by the direction of the State. I think the State has a right to call upon him to pay something for the privilege it is giving him, but, instead of doing that, all we do is to call upon him to contribute towards the endowment fund. I am afraid that I have been tempted to intervene in this debate at too great length. I only intended to correct what appeared to me exaggerated statements as to the state of the law, but I am not sorry for the opportunity of what appears to me to be the true view of the operation of this Bill.

EARL SPENCER: I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

COUNTY COURTS BILL [H.L.]

Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

POOR LAW AUTHORITIES (TRANSFER OF PROPERTY) BILL [H.L.]

Amendment reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

House adjourned at half-past Eleven o'clock till To-morrow at a quarter past four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 1*st August*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

COMMISSION.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went;—and, being returned;—

Mr. **SPEAKER** reported the Royal Assent to—

1. Finance Act, 1904.
2. Savings Banks Act, 1904.
3. Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
4. Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
5. Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
6. Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
7. Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Act, 1904.
8. Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Act, 1904.
9. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Act, 1904.
10. Thurles Urban District Council Water Act, 1904.
11. Ebbw Vale Water Act, 1904.
12. Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Act, 1904.
13. Bournemouth Corporation Act, 1904.
14. Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1904.
15. Lytham Improvement Act, 1904.
16. Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Act, 1904.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Ilford Urban District Council Billi [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Finance Bill, without Amendment.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill, with an Amendment.

Dean Forest Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Milldamhead; and Tyne Dock; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from South Shields, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Particulars regarding the proposed Army Organisation Scheme [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Statement showing the basis on which the estimated extra cost of £25,900,000 for conscription was made [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DRAINAGE OF LOUGH NEAGH AND THE LOWER BANN.

Copy presented, of Report on the Drainage of Lough Neagh and the Lower Bann, furnished to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland by Frederick J. Dick, M.I.C.E., Engineer to the Commissioners, 31st May, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3240 to 3242 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (COURTS-MARTIAL).

Copy presented of Return of the number of Courts-Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Statement of Particulars of Loans of which the Balances outstanding are proposed to be remitted or written off (in whole or in part) from the Assets of the Local Loans Fund.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The Government and the Chartered Company.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that delegates elected by the settlers in Rhodesia will, at the request of Dr. Jameson, shortly arrive in this country for the purpose of discussing with the directors of the Chartered Company terms under which the charter shall be cancelled, he will give the House an assurance that no terms will be agreed between the Government and the company which may involve any financial obligation on the Exchequer, before such terms are first submitted for the approval of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) His Majesty's Government have not been approached, either by the Chartered Company or by the Rhodesian settlers; and there is no reason for thinking that the contingency contemplated in the second part of the Question will arise.

Sale of Liquor on River Steamers.

MR. MARKHAM: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to a statement, made by the chairman of the Upper River Committee of the Thames Conservancy Board on 25th July, that many large steamers and launches on the river were floating beerhouses, open all day and night, and that neither the Conservators or licensing magistrates on the Thames had any control over such steamers, the owners of which could sell as much liquor as they liked; and will he, therefore, introduce legislation bringing the sale of liquor on river steamers under the licensing authority of the magistrates on the Thames.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have seen a newspaper report of the meeting of the Conservators to which the hon. Member refers. The question of the sale of intoxicating liquor on steamers in inland waters has been more than once under consideration; but it has not hitherto been found possible to frame provisions likely to be satisfactory and effective amendments of the law. I cannot say more than that the matter will not be lost sight of.

Army Reorganisation.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say when and how it is proposed that a decision should be come to on the proposed Army scheme, allowing of the commencement of enlistment of recruits for the infantry of the Line on the new conditions of service; and also when and how a decision is to be taken by the House or country putting an end to the existing uncertainty with regard to the future of the Militia.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Estimate for the War Office, if agreed to, seems to afford an adequate basis for any changes, not requiring legislation, which may be announced as in contemplation. As regards the second part of the Question, it would be desirable to wait until the second debate has taken place on the Secretary of State's scheme.

Post Office Savings Bank.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the Postmaster-General can he state the total amounts respectively of Post Office Savings Bank deposits and withdrawals in the year ending 31st December, 1903, and the six months ending 30th June, 1904, the total balance due to depositors (including interest) on 31st December, 1903, and 30th June, 1904, respectively; can he explain how it occurred that, on the 31st December 1903, the assets valued at the market price of the day, held by the Government on behalf of the Post Office Savings Banks, were insufficient to meet the total amount of deposits by the sum of £11,033,060 12s. 1d.; and can he explain why his Report for the year ending 31st March, 1904, is not yet issued.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank during the year ending the 31st December, 1903, amounted to £40,857,206, and the withdrawals to £42,786,025. The corresponding figures for the six months ending the 30th June, 1904, are £19,502,295 and £20,309,709 respectively. The total amounts standing to the credit of depositors on the 31st December, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904, were £146,135,147 and £147,083,000 respectively. The latter figure is only approximate. The reason why the liabilities of the Savings Bank were in excess of the assets, valued at the market price of the day on the 31st December, 1903, is to be found in the fact that the greater part of the Consols and other Government Stock held by the National Debt Commissioners on behalf of the Bank were purchased at a higher price than that current at the date in question. As pointed out, however, in my Answer to the hon. Member for North Camberwell on the 28th March,† a comparison of this nature is misleading, and does not give a correct view of the situation, seeing that the payment of the lawful claims of depositors is guaranteed by Government, and that they have as security the whole credit of the nation. My Report for the year ending the 31st March, 1904, is now in the press, and will be issued shortly.

Army Estimates.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the ultimate total of the automatic increase in the Army Estimates before any actual reduction of Estimates can begin.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) I am afraid it is impossible for me to give with any degree of certainty figures in regard to what the Army Estimates will be several years hence. The automatic increase or decrease must depend largely upon factors which cannot be calculated at the present time.

New Army Scheme—Earl Roberts' Views.

Mr. LAMBERT: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will ascertain what parts of his Army scheme Earl Roberts considers detrimental to the interests of the Army; and will he convey Earl Roberts' opinions to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) I am glad to say that Lord Roberts has been so good as to make me fully aware of his views, which are of great assistance to me. I have no authority to communicate his views to the House.

Lochcarron (Ross shire) Water Supply.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state what action has been taken by the Local Government Board for Scotland with a view to secure a suitable water supply for the village of Lochcarron, Ross-shire.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Local Government Board, on learning that the water supply to Lochcarron village was defective, at once drew the local authority's attention to the matter, and were informed in reply that in January last the local authority had given instructions to have the pumps repaired. The Board now learn that the water supply is in good order and the pumps working well, with the exception of one, the supply for which passes through crofters' ground, who oppose the opening of the drain until the crop is lifted. The chairman of the water supply committee is acting as interim water inspector to see that the plant is attended to and kept in repair.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxii, 814.

Closing of Chanonry Ferry.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that Chanonry Ferry, between Fort George and Chanonry Point, Fortrose, has been closed since May last; and, in view of the inconvenience which the closing of the ferry causes the public, will he consider the expediency of taking such steps as may be necessary to have it reopened for traffic.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I have no information of the fact mentioned in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, but in any case it is not a matter calling for the intervention of the Secretary for Scotland.

Annual Leave for Medical Officers in Remote Highland and Island Parishes.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if, when considering the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief in Scotland, he will take into consideration the position of those medical officers situated in remote Highland and Island parishes who, owing to geographical difficulties, are unable to name substitutes to act for them during illness or holidays; and, in view of the fact that those public servants have had no holiday for a number of years, owing to the high fees charged by *locum tenens*, he will cause arrangements to be made whereby these medical officers may have a free annual rest, such as can be enjoyed by their colleagues in other districts, and all other parish officials.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The revision of the rules for Poor Law Medical Relief in Scotland will be proceeded with as soon as legislative authority can be obtained, and due consideration will be given to the difficulty experienced by medical officers of remote parishes in procuring substitutes; but without legislation no alteration can be made on the existing rules. The question of holidays for medical officers has received the careful and sympathetic attention of the Local Government Board, as will be seen from their 6th Annual Report, pages xxv.–vi., but they have at present no authority to do more than they have there indicated.

Dismissal of the Parish Doctor of Durness, Sutherlandshire.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: To ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been drawn to the dismissal of the parish doctor by the parish council of Durness, Sutherlandshire, and to the fact that the doctor entered an action in the Court of Session, with the result that he was reinstated in his office and the parish involved in legal expenses amounting to over £200; that protests were lodged with the council against the doctor's dismissal by a majority of the ratepayers; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of taking steps to protect medical officers in crofting counties against such treatment, and to save the ratepayers from being burdened with legal expenses in similar cases in the future; and whether, seeing that this parish council disqualified two elected members of the council who were said to be friendly to the doctor, and replaced them by two others, one of whom was as similarly disqualified as the ejected members, steps will be taken to prevent the recurrence of such action.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am informed that the Local Government Board for Scotland are aware that the medical officer of Durness was recently dismissed by his parish council, and that he entered an action in the Court of Session, with the result that he was reinstated in his office, and expenses adjudged against the parish council. But the medical officer is the servant of the parish council and not of the Board, and legislation would be required to make him removeable from office only by the Board. As regards the latter part of the Question, I have no reason to anticipate the recurrence of such action on the part of a parish council, and am not prepared to take any steps in the matter.

Establishment of a Royal Naval Reserve Station at Ullapool.

Mr WEIR: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state when the establishment of a Royal Naval Reserve station at Ullapool is likely to be proceeded with.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The necessary sites have been secured, and contract particulars for the erection of the buildings are in hand.

Suggested Inquiry into the Management of Horton Lunatic Asylum.

Mr. WHITMORE (Chelsea): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the case of R. S. Clarke and others, tried at last assizes at Guildford on the 19th instant, and to the finding of the jury that they were of opinion that the Horton Lunatic Asylum had been grossly mismanaged, and that the conduct of the persons responsible for the administration of the asylum should be at once seriously inquired into; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I am informed by the Lunacy Commissioners that the matter is receiving careful consideration, and that they are awaiting the report of a sub-committee appointed by the Asylums Committee of the London County Council to inquire into the question.

Outdoor Relief—Supply of Pure Milk for Children.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the high death rate amongst infants in populous centres, and its connection with improper feeding, he will direct the attention of the Poor Law authorities to the importance of supplying out-relief children, who are hand fed, with pure milk and proper feeding bottles when the parents are unable to provide them.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) In the Answer which I gave to the Question put to me by the hon. Member on 16th June† I promised to bring under the notice of the inspectors his suggestion with regard to an allowance of milk in certain cases of out-door relief. This I have done. I will also draw their attention to the further suggestion now made by the hon. Member.

Case of Anthrax in Liverpool.

Mr. CUMMING MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that at an inquest recently held in Liverpool upon a man who had died from anthrax, it came out in the evidence that the deceased was shaved by a barber in Liverpool shortly before his death who, at deceased's request, cut open the swelling upon the deceased's face, thus causing a serious risk of anthrax being further spread; and, if so, will he take steps to prevent a recurrence of such action.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*). I am informed that the facts are as stated in the first part of the Question. The matter is entirely outside the scope of the Factory Act, and I have no power to take any action; but I may say that I am advised that the risk of anthrax being spread in this way would be small.

Crete—Extension of Clemency to Dr. Jaunaris.

Captain ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government will make any representations to the Governor-General of Crete, with the view to the extension of clemency to Dr. Jaunaris, who is still in confinement in Crete.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The case is not one in which His Majesty's Government can properly interfere.

Total Production of British Distilleries.

Mr KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the respective total production, during the years 1901, 1902, and 1903, of the distilleries of England,

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvi., 264.

Scotland, and Ireland, classifying the distilleries of each country under the headings of distilleries using pot stills only; distilleries using patent stills only; and distilleries using both pot and patent stills.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain*). Table showing the total production of spirits during the years ended 30th September, 1901, 1902, and 1903, of the distilleries of England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively; the distilleries being classified under the headings of distilleries using pot stills only; distilleries using patent stills only; and distilleries using both pot and patent stills:—

Country.	1901.			1902.			1903.		
	Distilleries using pot stills only. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using patent stills only. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using both pot and patent stills. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using pot stills only. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using patent stills only. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using both pot and patent stills. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using pot stills only. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using patent stills only. — Gallons at proof.	Distilleries using both pot and patent stills. — Gallons at proof.
England -	—	6,629,528	6,216,319	—	5,773,065	5,805,852	—	6,045,404	5,762,586
Scotland -	10,493,466	14,302,182	5,527,647	10,455,846	13,423,128	4,406,435	10,446,101	11,130,941	4,578,571
Ireland .	3,836,584	2,118,715	7,599,496	3,342,886	1,974,905	7,555,819	3,065,471	1,760,645	7,606,471

Early Closing in Government Offices.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, as the early closing of banks, insurance companies, and places of business generally on Saturdays or on some one other weekday has now become practically universal, he will arrange that the State shall extend the privilege now enjoyed by many Civil servants to all, as there are still a number of departments where the staff only leave early on every alternate Saturday; and whether, in view of the inequalities arising from the present system of decision by heads of departments, the Treasury will issue instructions to all departments to establish the uniform practice of closing early one day in each week, subject to the exigencies of the public services in cases of urgency.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The rule of the service, as laid down in the Orders in Council of 21st March, 1890, and 15th August, 1890, is that clerks giving a daily attendance of seven hours may be allowed a half-holiday on alternate Saturdays, provided the state of public business permits. I am not prepared to sanction any alteration of this rule in the direction suggested by the hon. Member.

Reduction of Salary of an Irish Teacher owing to Reduced Attendance caused by an Epidemic.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the teacher's salary in school roll No. 1424, district 24, circuit 9A, was considerably reduced owing to a decrease of a unit in the average attendance, due to causes over which the teacher had no control, as certified by the medical officer of the district; and, in view of the fact that the requisite average has since been maintained, whether the teacher's claim to full salary will be reconsidered.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The teacher was paid at the rate of £72 per annum to 31st December, 1903, but as the average attendance of pupils at the school for the year ended on that date fell below twenty his salary was reduced to £56 per annum from 1st January, 1904, in accordance with the provisions of Rules 200 II. (i) and 212 (b) of the Code. The required average of twenty has been maintained for the quarters ended 31st March and 30th June, 1904, and should the average for the year ending 31st December, 1904, reach twenty the question of restoring to the teacher his former rate of salary from 1st January, 1904, will be considered.

Connection between Monasterevan and Castlecomer.

MR. HAMMOND (Carlow): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a public grant of £40,000 was made in 1801 by the Parliament of that time for the construction of a canal in Ireland from Monasterevan to the collieries of Castlecomer, and that this grant was never used for the purpose indicated; and, if so, can this money be now rendered available to provide a connection by railway between these same collieries and the railway system of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The hon. Member has communicated to me a statement from which it appears that the directors of inland navigation proposed to make a grant-in-aid, to the amount mentioned, towards the cost of construction of a canal between Monasterevan and Castlecomer, the payment to be conditional upon the execution of the work. The money was otherwise expended, however, and consequently is not available for the purpose referred to.

Money Due on Mortgages on Estates of the Irish Society.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how much money is due on foot of mortgages on the estates of the honourable the Irish Society in Ireland other than to the Commissioners of Public Works, the names of the corporations or individuals by whom the mortgages are held, the amount thereof respectively, and the rate or rates of interest payable thereunder.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Government has no information in respect of these matters.

Allege. Sale of Drink During Prohibited Hours at Ballynahinch.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that public-houses in Ballynahinch continually sell drink on Sundays and other times contrary to the licensing laws, he will direct the attention of the police authorities to this illegality, with a view of putting a stop to the practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There is no such general practice at Ballynahinch so far as the police are aware. The police are constantly on the alert to detect breaches of the licensing laws, and they will continue to give the matter their close attention.

Army Reorganisation—Depot of Ross-shire Regiments.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, under the new scheme of Army Reorganisation, the depot of all Ross-shire regiments will be established at Dingwall. the county town.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The new scheme of Army Reorganisation is still under the consideration of the Army Council, and it is at present impossible to give any details regarding it.

Army Council Bill—Procedure with Regard to War Department Orders in Council.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, under the Army Council Bill, should it become an Act, Orders in Council relating to the War Department will in future be based on representations from the Secretary of State for War submitted for the approval of the King in Council, made on the advice of the Privy Council, and issued by the direction of the Secretary of State for War; and, if not, what form is in future to be adopted with regard to War Department Orders in Council.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The reply is in the affirmative. The procedure will be as hitherto.

Pensions of Civil Servants Serving in New Guinea previous to its Transfer to the Australian Government.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether officers in the Colonial service, who served in British New Guinea before the transfer of that territory to the Australian Government, are entitled to have their service there taken into consideration in computing the amount of their pensions on retirement; and, if not, whether he will state for what reason such service is excluded from consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) All officers serving in British New Guinea, previous to the transfer of its administration to the Australian Government, were appointed on the distinct understanding that their appointments were provisional, and liable to be terminated at any time without notice or compensation. They are therefore not entitled to any pension in respect of such service.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Army Estimates.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the ultimate total of the automatic increase in the Army Astimates before any actual reduction of Estimates can begin.

* The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): I am afraid it is impossible for me to give with any degree of certainty figures in regard to what the Army Estimates will be several years hence. The automatic increase or decrease must depend largely upon factors which cannot be calculated at the present time.

Mr. LAMBERT: But cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the amount of the ultimate increase?

* Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am afraid not.

Army Recruiting.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when it is proposed to commence recruiting for the general-service and home-service Armies.

* Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: As I informed the hon. Member a few days ago in reply to a similar Question,† I cannot yet give the date at which recruiting for general-service and home-service, respectively, will be commenced.

Lord Roberts and the Army Scheme.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will ascertain what parts of his Army Scheme Earl Roberts considers detrimental to the interests of the Army; and will he convey Earl Roberts' opinions to the House.

* Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am glad to say that Lord Roberts has been so good as to make me fully aware of his views, which are of great assistance to me. I have no authority to communicate his views to the House.

Chinese Indentured Labour Depots.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies under what agreement the Chinese Government is providing the depots for the reception of indentured labourers; can he say who is paying for the labour and material which is being used in their erection; and when Article III. of the Convention, which provides that the British Government shall erect and fit up these depots at its own expense, was varied or abrogated.

The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): There is no agreement other than the Convention. The position and obligations of the Chinese Government are there defined. See especially Articles 1 and 3. The depots are being erected at the expense of the Transvaal Government. As I explained to the hon. Member on 1st May,† the British Government is responsible to the Chinese Government under the Convention on behalf of any Colonial Government which may desire to import indentured Chinese labourers, but the charges will be borne in each case by the Colonial Government.

Mr. WHITLEY: Last Thursday the right hon. Gentleman told me the Chinese Government were erecting these buildings, and now——

* Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot discuss previous Answers.

Mr. WHITLEY: I want to know who is paying for the labour and material.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii. 1332.

See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 434.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The Transvaal Government are in the first instance liable.

Mr. WHITLEY: Who is paying out the money?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I presume the Transvaal Government are. I have not traced the cheques, but if the hon. Gentleman wishes, I will do so.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire? If the British Government are paying out the money, clearly there should be Parliamentary authority.

Race Troubles in Johannesburgh—Report of Lynching.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information showing that a vigilance committee of whites has been elected at Johannesburg and has already lynched a native in that city; whether, in the event of his having no information upon the subject, he will make inquiry as to the truth of the alleged facts, and will insist that steps shall be taken by the Government of the colony to prevent lawless interference with the course of justice.

Mr. LYTTELTON: Lord Milner informs me that the report of lynching is absolutely unfounded, and is due to the discovery of the body of a native who was clearly proved at the inquest to have committed suicide. He is satisfied that the idea of the existence of a secret organisation to punish natives assaulting white people is pure imagination.

Island of Tristan d'Acunha.

Mr. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the statements made in this House on 22nd June, 30th July, and 11th August, 1903, by the late Secretary of State for the Colonies, with regard to the proposed deportation to South Africa of the small white Colony in the Island of Tristan d'Acunha; and whether any further steps, and if so what steps, have been taken in the matter.

Mr. LYTTELTON: It was arranged with the Cape Government that they should send a Commissioner to the island to make an offer on their behalf to the Islanders for their removal to the Cape Colony. This gentleman proceeded in the "Odin" and interviewed the Islanders in January last, but they decided to remain.

Mr. Arnold Forster's Statement on Labour Recruiting in China.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he has made any inquiries as to the authenticity of the statements of Mr. Arnold Forster with reference to the manner in which recruiting labour is carried on in China for the Transvaal.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have sent a copy of the Reverend Arnold Forster's statement to Lord Milner asking for his observations upon it.

Losses Inflicted on the Tibetans.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state his computation of Tibetan killed and wounded to the present date.

*__The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA__ (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): Estimates of the losses inflicted on the Tibetans have only been received in respect of five actions, and for these the figures are 1,065 killed and wounded and 270 prisoners. In other engagements it has presumably been impossible to determine the enemy's losses.

*__Mr. LAMBERT__: Can the right hon. Gentleman specify the killed and wounded?

Mr. BRODRICK: I am afraid I cannot, I can only give the figures as they reached us.

French Congo—British Merchants' Claims.

Mr. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give any information as to the progress of the negotiations with the French Government for the settlement of the claims of the British merchants in the French Congo, and with respect to the interpretation of the free-trade clauses of the Berlin Act.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): I can make no statement at the present stage of the negotiations.

Contraband of War.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have taken any steps, either alone or in conjunction with other neutral Powers, to call the attention of the Russian and Japanese Governments to the extension of articles which have been proclaimed by them respectively to be contraband of war; and whether they have protested, or propose to protest, against the assumption by those Governments that it is for belligerent Powers to declare what articles are or are not contraband of war, without reference to the rights of neutrals.

EARL PERCY: His Majesty's Government have instructed His Majesty's Ambassador to lodge a protest with the Russian Government against the inclusion of foodstuffs in the list of articles declared by them to be contraband of war. With regard to the latter portion of the Question, His Majesty's Government do not consider that the present moment is opportune for making a public statement of policy.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) asked whether the protest applied to cotton, which was also declared to be contraband.

EARL PERCY: The protest applies to the inclusion of food. The hon. Member is aware that it was explained that the inclusion of cotton only referred to cotton destined for the manufacture of explosives.

Transvaal War Contribution.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he ntends to make any protest against the absence of any provision in the Transvaal Estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1905, for the first instalment of the war contribution.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): No. Sir.

Post Office Savings Bank.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, can he state the total amounts respectively of Post Office Savings Bank deposits and withdrawals in the year ending 31st December, 1903, and the six months ending 30th June, 1904, the total balance due to depositors (including interest) on 31st December, 1903, and 30th June, 1904, respectively; can he explain how it occurred that, on the 31st of December, 1903, the assets, valued at the market price of the day, held by the Government on behalf of the Post Office Savings Banks were insufficient to meet the total amount of deposits by the sum of £11,033,060 12s. 1d.; and can he explain why his Report for the year ending 31st March, 1904, is not yet issued.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Perhaps, as the Answer is a long one, my hon. friend will allow me to circulate it with the Votes.

Physical Deterioration —Report of Departmental Committee.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board if he proposes to take action on the Report of the Departmental Committee on Physical Degeneration, with reference to the recommendation that in all towns above a certain size the local authority should establish and maintain an accurate register of owners, and that this practice was one ot the first desiderata towards dealing with slum property.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The Report of the Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration has only been issued within the last few days, and the evidence taken by the Committee has not yet been published. I have not at present been able to consider the recommendations made by the Committee, though of course I shall do so. I may, however, say that the particular suggestion to which the hon. Member refers is not a new one, and there would be considerable difficulty in giving effect to it.

Counterfeit Coining—Newspaper Instruction.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his atttention has been called to a recent Old Bailey case of counterfeit coining, in which the prisoner admitted that he had learnt how to make counterfeit coin from a full description of it in a daily newspaper by a criminal; and whether, in view of the opinion expressed by the jury and by the Common Sergeant condemning the action of such newspaper, he will state whether he can take any steps to prevent such facilitation of crime in future.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Yes, Sir; and I have consulted the Common Sergeant in the matter. I fully agree with his opinion as to the mischievous tendency of the article in question, and that the newspaper which published it is deserving of the gravest censure. I cannot, however, say more than that the whole question of incitement to crime by means of such articles is receiving the attention of my Department and of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Workmen's Compensation.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state on what date the Departmental Committee for the consideration of Amendments to the Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Acts was appointed; how many sittings it has held; whether its Report has yet been presented; and whether he still proposes to introduce a Bill on this subject this session.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The Committee was appointed on the 16th November, 1903. It has held thirty-seven meetings, all of which, except four, were full day meetings. It has examined seventy-six witnesses. The work of the Committee has been exceedingly laborious, and in addition to the evidence taken at the meetings the Committee has obtained a large amount of information in writing from County Court Judges, Employers' and Workmen's Associations and Insurance Companies. I understand that the Report has been signed to-day, and I hope to lay it on the Table without delay; but as I stated the other day, I cannot hope to introduce a Bill on the subject this session. When hon. Members see the Report they will, I think, recognise what an extremely heavy task the consideration of any such legislation necessarily is.

Rev. Mr. Gleeson and the Roundstone Police.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state on what date did the Reverend Mr. Gleeson, P.P., of Roundstone, complain verbally to the district inspector and head constable regarding the conduct of Sergeant Ryan and Constable Laidley; on what date did he make his written complaint to Sir Antony MacDonnell; whether he can state the nature of the charges made in both cases; were the policemen supplied with copies of these complaints; were there any unfavourable marks entered against Sergeant Ryan and Constable Laidley, transferred as a result of these charges.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): No verbal complaint was made to the district inspector or head constable. On the 17th August, 1903, the Rev. Mr. Gleeson wrote to the Under-Secretary complaining of the conduct of Sergeant Ryan and Constable Laidley in respect of a display of flags from licensed premises at Roundstone, viz.: that the sergeant and constable had notified the proprietors of licensed houses that it was against the law to have their houses decorated. On the 18th August, the Under-Secretary forwarded Father Gleeson's letter to the Inspector-General for report. The Inspector-General sent the letter on to the local police officers. On the 21st August the district inspector reported that all publicans denied having been spoken to except one (Mr. Tuchy). He added that he did not think the action of the police prudent. On the 23rd August, the county inspector reported that the police had acted very improperly. On the 2nd September the Inspector-General concurred, and recommended that the sergeant should be warned and that Constable Laidley should be transferred in pursuance of a report made against him in respect of another matter by the county inspector on the 15th August, that is two days before the Reverend Mr. Gleeson complained. The complaint and decision were communicated to the men on 17th September. They represented that they had not been previously informed of the nature of the complaint. This was a regrettable omission on the part of the local police officers. The whole matter is an exceedingly small one, being confined to whether the police acted prudently in discussing with a publican the legality of putting out flags, and whether they acted properly in doing so without reporting the matter and asking for instructions. No unfavourable records were entered against the men. Sergeant Ryan was not transferred. Constable Laidley was moved to another district, but, as I have said, not in connection with this incident.

Kinvara Harbour.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): On behalf of the hon. Member for South Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the old pier at Kinvara Harbour recently gave way, precipitating a horse and cart and several people into the water below; whether he is aware that the harbour is becoming more dangerous; and, if so, whether, in view of the effect of the condition of the entrance to the basin and the present state of the pier upon the trade of the district and the potato and barley market, and in view of the promises given by the Galway County Council, the Congested Districts Board, and the Agricultural Board, to assist in putting the pier and harbour into a fit state for trading, he will take steps to have the necessary improvements carried out.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have nothing to add to my reply to the similar Question addressed to me on Monday last by the hon. Member for Limerick.†

Boyne Salmon Fisheries.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the close season for salmon fishing begins on 5th August for the No. 17 (1) (Drogheda) district, whilst that for No. 17 (2) (Dundalk) does not begin until October; and whether, seeing that these districts extend respectively south and north of the mouth of the Boyne, and that complaints have been repeatedly made as to the destruction of spawning fish approaching the Boyne along the 17 (2) district, and the consequent reduction of spring fish in the river, the Department of Agriculture has powers to unite these two districts and fix on the same date for the commencement of the close season for both; and, if not, what steps, if any, are to be taken to find if the complaints are valid, and, if so, to remove the cause.

MR. WYNDHAM: The close eason for salmon netting in tidal waters commences in the Drogheda district on the 5th August, in that part of the Dundalk district which adjoins the Drogheda district, on the 20th August, and in other parts of the Dundalk district on 16th September and 1st October respectively. In the present state of the law, the Department is unable to alter existing close seasons. The amalgamation of the districts, even if carried out, would not have the effect of assimilating the close seasons in the two districts.

In reply to a further Question by the hon. Member, Mr. WYNDHAM said he could not undertake to initiate legislation in the question this session.

Railway Facilities in Sligo.

MR. WILLIAM McKILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Lord-Lieutenant has received a petition praying for the construction of a line of railway in the district of Tireragh, county Sligo, between Collooney and Ballina, signed by merchants, landowners, and representatives of public bodies in Sligo and Mayo; and, if so, whether, seeing that the ratepayers of Tireragh have offered to give a guarantee, and that nothing has been hitherto done by the Government to assist in developing this district, he can hold out any hope that effect will be given to the prayer of the petitioners.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 1056.

MR. WYNDHAM: The petition has been received. There are no public funds available out of which to contribute towards the cost of construction of the proposed line of railway.

Mohill Evicted Tenant.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that John Maguire, of Adoon, Gorvagh, Mohill, county Leitrim, has applied to the Estates Commissioners for reinstatement in the farm from which he was evicted, or in the alternative for a new farm, and has received no reply from the Commissioners; and if he will state what steps he proposes to take to redeem the promises which he held out for the restoration of such people when promoting the Land Bill of last year.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners have informed this evicted tenant that his application was under consideration, and that they would again communicate with him as soon as they were in a position to take action in his case.

Nicholson Estate, County Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Nicholson Estate, situate at Castlebaldwin, near Riverstown, county Sligo, and at present administered by the Land Judge's Court, contains a large grazing farm surrounded by uneconomic holdings; and whether, in the event of the sale of this estate to the tenants taking place, he will see that this ranche be utilised for the enlargement of the small holdings surrounding it.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is some difficulty in identifying this estate from the information given in the Question. I have asked the hon. Member to supply me with further details.

Cork Port Sanitary Authority—Smallpox By-Laws.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Cork port sanitary authority have requested the Local Government Board to make regulations with reference to smallpox so as to enable them to make by-laws similar to those made by the Barry and Cadoxton Local Board; that the Local Government Board have declined to make such regulations on the ground that there is no section in the Irish Public Health Acts corresponding to Section 125 of the English Public Health Act, 1875, under which these regulations are made; and whether, seeing that the Local Government Board have made regulations of a similar nature with reference to cholera, yellow fever, and plague, he will explain why regulations cannot be made with reference to smallpox.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member is under some misapprehension. The General Regulations made by the Local Government Board in Ireland under Sections 148 and 149 of the Irish Public Health Act, 1878, which deal with cholera, yellow fever, or plague are identical with those made by the Local Government Board in England under the corresponding sections of the English Public Health Act of 1875, namely: Sections 130 and 134. But the local authority in England has, under the 125th Section of the English Act, power itself to make regulations, to be approved by the Local Government Board, dealing with persons suffering from infectious and dangerous disorders brought within their district by any ship or boat. It is under this latter section that regulations were made by the Barry and Cadoxton Board referred to in the Question. There is not any section in the Irish Public Health Act corresponding with the 125th Section of the English Act, conferring this power on the local authority.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: But what difficulty can there be in giving them the same power?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It would need an Act of Parliament.

Captain DONELAN (Cork County, E.): Is it not possible to confer the powers on the Cork authority under a Provisional Order which is now before Parliament?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I believe not, but I will inquire.

Ardagh Burial Ground.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the proposal of the rural district council of Longford to obtain an additional loan of £100 for the completion of the new burial ground at Ardagh will be sanctioned; and, if so, when.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The application for the loan was received only ten days ago. The decision of the Local Government Board will be communicated to the council as soon as possible.

Dopping Estate, North Longford.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have yet come to a decision on the subject of the issue of a request for the sale of the Dopping Estate in North Longford.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No request to the Land Judge has yet been issued by the Commissioners in respect of this estate.

Mr. Mahony's Land Appeal Case.

Mr. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the delay in regard to the hearing of the land appeal case of Mr. T. Mahony, 35, Wellington Road, Cork, which was entered in the chief Land Commission Court in April, 1902, and has not yet been heard; whether he is aware that the Commissioners sat in Cork in June, 1903, only to hear postponed cases; that they sat again in May of this year, and did not hear any of the cases listed from Cork division; and whether he can say when Mr. Mahony's case is likely to be heard.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am informed that this case was on the list for hearing in May, but that it could not be dealt with within the time at the disposal of the Commissioners. It accordingly stands over to the next Cork Sitting on the understanding that it will be placed first in the appeal list for hearing at Cork.

Mr. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: When is that likely?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I do not know.

Rathmines Commissioners' Appeal.

Mr. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state when the decision of the Local Government Board will be given on the appeal of the Rathmines Commissioners from the order of the Dublin County Council; and if he can state the cause of the delay.

Mr. WYNDHAM: It is impossible to state, even approximately, when the Board will arrive at a decision in the case. I am informed that important questions of law have arisen in connection with it, and that upon these the Board is taking the opinion of counsel.

Mr. MOONEY was understood to ask if the right hon. gentleman would take steps to expedite matters?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I can add nothing to my Answer.

Wicklow Canteen Licence.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has considered the action of Mr. James Shanks in signing a licence certificate for a canteen situated in the county Wicklow, Mr. Shanks not being a magistrate for that county, and the local magistrates having refused to grant the licence on the ground that the canteen had been conducted in a disorderly manner; and whether he can now state what decision the Lord Chancellor has come to in regard to Mr. Shanks' action.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Mr. Shanks has informed the Lord Chancellor that at the time he signed the order he was not aware that an application had been made to, and refused by, the justices at petty sessions. He was, moreover, under the impression that the camp at Kilbride was in the county of Dublin and within his jurisdiction. The Lord Chancellor has accepted Mr. Shanks' explanation and does not propose to take any further action in the matter.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR asked if it were fitting that a man who professed so much ignorance of his duties should remain on the bench.

MR. WYNDHAM did not reply.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I shall let the right hon. Gentleman know more of this scandalous case on the Vote for his salary.

Rum and Black River Drainage.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the total amount of money expended in the drainage of the Rum and Black River drainage district; for how much of this ratepayers in county Longford are responsible; and what is the amount in the £ levied on these ratepayers this year?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): I have no information as to the amount expended by the drainage board, which is a private body, in this particular district. Sums amounting to over £37,000 have been advanced by the Commissioners of Public Works to the drainage board for expenditure on new works, and the final instalment of repayment falls due on the 1st November, 1905. The persons liable to pay are not the ratepayers of county Longford, but the owners or occupiers of improved land, and they pay not by a rate in the pound, but in proportions assessed on their share in the improvements.

National Library of Ireland—Mr. Evans' Salary.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the deduction made from the salary of Mr. Evans, National Library of Ireland, was properly made, in view of the fact that no deductions were ever made from the pay of the other eleven members of the permanent staff of attendants in the National Library of Ireland for the purpose of entitling them to pension, whose appointments were made on exactly the same terms; and whether, in view of this fact, the money should be refunded to Mr. Evans.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I have already informed the hon. and learned Member that the deduction was properly made and cannot be refunded. Mr. Evans' original appointment differed from those of the other eleven members of the permanent staff, as it was prior to 1891 when a title to pension was first granted to the staff. By submitting to the deduction he was enabled to count the whole of his previous service from the age of sixteen, so far as it was remunerated from public funds.

Temporary Assistants in Irish Government Offices.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, whether he is aware that certain temporary assistants in Government offices in Ireland working seven hours per day receive 30s. per week, and those in other offices receive 35s. per week; and that, when certain of the former were placed on the permanent staff as assistant clerks, a deduction of 10 per cent. per annum was made from their salaries, whilst in the case of the latter a deduction to £90 per annum only was made; and, if so, whether steps will be taken to place the clerks thus added to the permanent service on an equal footing with each other.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: If the hon. Member will furnish me with particulars of the cases to which he refers I will inquire into the circumstances and inform him as to the result.

Irish Art: Grant-in-Aid.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what were the conditions attaching to the grant in aid of Irish art purposes, out of which the cost of the addition to the National Gallery has been defrayed; and whether all those conditions have been fulfilled.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The Countess of Milltown offered a collection of pictures, etc., to the National Gallery of Ireland in 1898 on condition that provision should be made for their separate exhibition. The gift was accepted and the necessary addition was made to the building at the cost of the Government. The hon. Member will see that this expenditure was in compliance with a condition, and not subject to a condition as he seems to suppose.

Ecclesiastical Disorders.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say when the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Disorders in the Church will issue its Report.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I understand there is no prospect of this Report being issued in the course of the present year.

Dr. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye.): Seeing the great interest that is taken in the inquiry by a great number of people, will the right hon. Gentleman use his influence to get an interim Report?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite ready to consult with my right hon. friend the Chairman of the Commission. I agree with the hon. Gentleman that the work is extremely important, and the evidence given extremely valuable, but whether anything would be gained by an interim Report I am not prepared to say.

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he intends to proceed with the Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill this session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Unless this Bill should prove quite uncontroversial, I am afraid it has little chance of passing this session.

Dr. FARQUHARSON: This is practically a non-controversial Bill. It embodies principles which are working well in Scotland, and which are very much needed in England.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I entirely agree with the hon. Member. The sooner England adopts that and many other Scottish Acts the better for England. But that does not get over the difficulty. Even though England may be panting to take the reform which we have so long adopted in Scotland, there may be a few recalcitrant English Members who may wish to discuss it at length; and I am afraid that in that case lunacy must wait for another session.

Proposed Estimates Committee.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, can he state whether any decision has been arrived at by His Majesty's Government with reference to the recommendation of the Committee on National Expenditure, that an Estimates Committee should be appointed at the commencement of each session for examination and report on one class of Estimates annually.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, sir, no final decision has been arrived at. I gave my hon. friend the views of the Government some time ago in answer to a Question—views that had been come to after consultation with the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, though, of course, the right hon. Gentleman is in no sense responsible for anything I said. I have nothing to add to that Answer.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): Is there any chance that the First Lord of the Treasury will find a day before the end of the session for the discussion of the Report on National Expenditure.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to point out, as I have been referred to as recalcitrant, that at the time I was far from being recalcitrant, and rather urged upon the right hon. Gentleman that a day ought to be given for the discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it would be an interesting and profitable employment of Parliamentary time to discuss both the Report on National Expenditure and the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee; but I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me that neither he nor I greatly desire to stay for that discussion.

Public Accounts Committee's Report.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, can he now state what arrangements have been made for the allocation of a day during this session for the reception and discussion by the House of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it possible to find an opportunity this session for the discussion of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Could not one of the three extra days to be allotted to Supply be devoted to it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, yes, if the House generally agree to give up to the subject one of the three extra allotted days, it might be done, but I do not think such general agreement is likely.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Why not take Friday next?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid we have business more important for that day.

Scottish Estimates.

MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the fact that only a half day has been spent in the discussion of Scottish Estimates, he can see his way to set apart a day before the end of the session for their further consideration.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe that the day devoted or intended to be devoted to Scottish Estimates was interrupted by one of the Motions for adjournment on the subject of labour in the Transvaal, and therefore was not fully available. I cannot promise a whole day for the continuation of the discussion, but I trust some further opportunity may be afforded before Supply closes.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE [MONEY].

Committee to consider of authorising the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sum which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and of making provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Allan Heywood Bright, esquire, for the County of Salop (Western or Oswestry Division).

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 297.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the whole House for To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 288.]

NEW BILL

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

"To grant money for the purpose of certain Local Loans out of the Local Loans Fund; and for other purposes relating to Local Loans," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 289.]

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

"To continue various Expiring Laws," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 290.]

VOTE OF CENSURE—MINISTERS OF THE CROWN.

(PREFERENTIAL DUTIES).

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I rise for the purpose of moving: "That this House regrets that certain of His Majesty's Ministers have accepted official positions in a political organisation which has formally declared its adhesion to a policy of preferential duties involving the taxation of food." Sir, in seeking to commend this Motion to the House, it will not be necessary for me to concern myself with the merits or demerits of the two fiscal policies between which the Government has fluctuated—one, the policy, so-called, of Sheffield, which they support, but, so far as we can observe, with no great degree of enthusiasm or real sympathy; and the policy of Birmingham, with which they do sympathise, although they protest that as a body they cannot support it. Which is the more powerful immediate political factor, their sympathy or their support, is an interesting question which cannot now engage our attention. But what we wish to do at present is to ascertain from the Prime Minister how he reconciles with his Ministerial statements regarding the policy which is avowed the action of certain colleagues of his, members of the Government, in giving their open support to the policy and propaganda which are publicly disavowed and disclaimed. The Prime Minister will not deny that the adherence thus given to the cause of the right hon. Member for Birmingham is a fit subject for us to interrogate him upon. There is surely something left, there is surely still some little force in the recognised doctrine of collective Ministerial responsibility. It is true the doctrine has been considerably shaken of recent years. Taking one matter which is perhaps more a matter of taste than a rule of order, everyone has observed the growing tendency on the part of Ministers to supersede the personal pronoun plural by the personal pronoun singular. In all the statements that they make as to policy and administration there is much more of the "I" than the "we." It is a small matter, as I said, but it is indicative and significant all the same, and it shows that the same process is going on all over. The Government is nothing, if not an independent Government. It is trying, and has tried for years, to be, so far as it may, independent of the House of Commons. It boasts and acts, or fails to act in consequence of its boast, that it is independent of the electorate. And now, apparently, they are not satisfied without being independent of each other. These are all parts of the same destructive and unconstitutional process. But the theory, at all events, of collective authority and responsibility remains, and therefore my Motion is directed not only against the individual members of the Government who have hoisted protectionist colours, but against the Government itself, which has sanctioned, or at all events acquiesced in, such a proceeding.

How is the action of Lord Lansdowne and Lord Selborne and the Secretary to the Treasury held to be compatible with the official position and declarations of the Government? Of course we are here also led to consider the policy of the Government itself, as to which we are more than ever in perplexity after the demonstrations that have been made at the Empire Theatre and the Albert Hall. We want a clear statement which may enable the House and the country to understand the nature of the fiscal principles which have obtained the mastery of the mind of the Government, the principles upon which their convictions have, we presume, by this time been formed and settled, the principles which in a concrete shape they intend to lay before the electorate at the general election. And, even more, we desire to know whether the Government still regards its programme as distinct from and incompatible with the other programme which is actively and conspicuously supported by certain of its members, and which has the unabated sympathy of the Prime Minister himself. In that case it ought to be unnecessary, I should think it must be unnecessary, to point out that their assurance, if given in the affirmative, that there is still a clear distinction between the two policies, will have little weight unless the Prime Minister can tell us he has invited the resignation of their offices by those of his colleagues who differ from him on this vital point. The answer, in short, which we shall expect is one which will accord with the recent proceedings, as well as with the previous verbal pledges given by the Government.

Now let us examine the nature of the proceedings that have taken place. The Foreign Secretary and the First Lord of the Admiralty have accepted the position of high officials under the right hon. Gentleman the

Member for West Birmingham, in an association whose delegated members passed with acclamation a resolution in favour of preferential duties—that is, the taxation of food and raw material. [Cries of "No, no!"] I do not press the raw material point, because of controversy with the right hon. Gentleman; but, of course, we all know that there are countries and colonies with which you cannot have preferential treatment unless you tax raw material. I do not wish to go into the merits of this question at all. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Why?"] Because it is out of order to begin with. Lord Lansdowne says—"Why should they not do this? Why should they not accept these positions? Why should they not indicate their sympathy with something beyond the Government programme?" He talks of the new doctrine that the leaders of a Party have no business to take any part in the proceedings of their followers, if these proceedings carry them beyond the officially accepted programme of the Government, and he finds an example in the National Union of Conservative Associations, which repeatedly passed year after year protectionist resolutions, the meetings of which, notwithstanding, Lord Salisbury used to attend, and no one, he points out, was a penny the worse. Sir, there really is no analogy between the two cases. No one paid any attention to resolutions passed at the National Union of Conservative Associations. They were very interesting as an indication of the movements and feeling within the Party to those who cared to watch them, but they had no effect on the political situation at the time. Certainly Lord Salisbury never expressed his "unabated" sympathy with the resolutions, and with the cause which was in those days associated mostly with the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield. There was a Sheffield policy in those days as well as now, but it was a policy of a very different sort. Its ultimate end was probably the same; its ultimate consequences certainly were the same, and its ultimate intention may have been. Of that we cannot speak with certainty, but its method and its manner were entirely different. It was unambiguous, intelligible, straightforward. When I compare the Sheffield policy of the past and the Sheffield policy of the present, I am reminded of a passage in which Dr. Arnold describes his feelings towards members of the Church of Rome on the one hand, and towards members of the Church of England on the other hand, who, in his view, were engaged in aping and imitating the doctrines and the practices of that Church. He says—

> "One is a Frenchman in his own uniform within his own *principia*; the other is a Frenchman disguised in a red coat and holding a post within our *concilia*, for the purpose of betraying."

And he goes on to say—

> "I honour the first and would hang the second."

Now, as far as Lord Salisbury is concerned, and as far as his influence was exerted, it was directed to damping down the protectionist tendencies among his followers and dissociating his Party from it. I am aware that is not the universal view. There was a shrewd observer who had his eye upon it in those somewhat distant years in 1885, and he said—

> "I will say that Lord Salisbury does intend, he and his friends, to put a duty on corn, although he does not think it convenient at the present moment to say so, and although he allows some members of his Government to argue in favour of it in one place, he enjoins on the other members of the Government the duty of repudiating everything about it.'

It is almost prophetic, the personages and the circumstances being somewhat changed. That was the view taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and he drew this final moral lesson from the contemplation of Lord Salisbury at these meetings of the Conservative Union—

> "Remember this is not a question upon which the Government can be allowed to have two voices."

That is the right hon. Gentleman's view of Lord Salisbury, but I am bound to say that, although I never had such full opportunities of knowing Lord Salisbury as he had, this is not my view either of his conduct at that time or of his general character. I believe that Lord Salisbury certainly never endorsed any such resolution, and I very much doubt whether he ever knew of its existence. Contrast this with the circumstances in which the Prime Minister's colleagues, with his apparent sanction, have become associated with this organisation.

The circumstances are fresh in our memory. The Liberal Unionist Association, of which the Duke of Devonshire was president, suffered shipwreck on a question which had nothing whatever to do with Liberal Unionism. It split on the rock of protection, and when the right hon. Member for West Birmingham came forward and reconstituted the organisation he never disguised his intention—I will say that this is very much in the right hon. Gentleman's favour, and that he is not a man who deals in disguises—to identify it with the cause he has at heart. The Ministers knew perfectly well what they were doing, and what significance would attach to their action when they accepted positions as office-bearers directly this violent disruption had taken place. They must have known what conclusions would be drawn throughout the country. They must have known that the Prime Minister knew it would be inferred in the country that the cause of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham was winning with the Ministry, that the Birmingham propaganda and the Birmingham theory, that the Empire can only be maintained by preferential duties and that British trade depends on protection, was no longer ruled out of the official programme. The inference is not merely not unnatural; it is the logical and proper deduction based on the belief in the prevalence of the doctrine of Cabinet authority and responsibility. The general purpose, design, and intention of the new organisation is notorious. We might rest there. But I have more to advance. What was the resolution passed at the council meeting immediately before or simultaneously with the announcement that those members of the Government had joined? It was not the original resolution on the agenda paper; it was cut down and tampered with to meet the case of those new office-bearers. The excision of the President's name from the resolution appears to have removed whatever apprehension may have been originally felt. Here it is—

> "That this council, believing that the time has come for a complete reform of our fiscal system, approves of the demands made by the Prime Minister for increased powers to deal with hostile tariffs and the practice of dumping"—[that is the orthodox policy of Sheffield]—"and further expresses its earnest hope that the ties of sympathy which already unite the British Empire may be strengthened by a commercial union with the Colonies based on preferential arrangements between them and the mother country."

There you have it, the fusion of the two policies—the official policy and what was supposed, down to the other day, to be the non-official, or quasi-official, policy of preference and food taxes. I say it was supposed, because after the unequivocal adhesion which the acceptance of office in the council of the right hon. Member for Birmingham involves, and after the message, ostentatiously public and openly conveyed, of the Prime Minister's "unabated" sympathy, how are we to know it remains the official policy any longer? Lord Lansdowne, indeed, disclaims identity, sees no modification of the Sheffield policy, no irreconcilable antagonisms between retaliation and preferences, points out that if you carry the practice of retaliation you will destroy all opportunity of introducing preference. He disavows any intention on the part of the Government to put the issue of food taxes before the country. Of that I say, *Que diable allait-il faire dans cette galère?* If these are the principles, what is he doing as a member of this new council? Why did he become a vice-president under the right hon. Gentleman's presidency? These Ministers have not divested themselves of their Ministerial capacity by merely donning the uniform of the Tariff Reform League, and they cannot become anti-food and orthodox Sheffielders by merely taking it off again. Lord Lansdowne's arguments imply that this persuading to the accepted policy is fatal to the grander policy which, as vice-president of this preferential association, he hopes and trusts will be accepted by the nation. Neither the Prime Minister nor the right hon. Member for West Birmingham are troubled with these misgivings, and I think it would be more becoming when the master craftsmen have agreed that the pieces dovetail, if a mere journeyman artificer like Lord Lansdowne had submitted his judgment in this matter to the higher authority, We have to ask the Prime Minister to explain to us to-day—recalling and bearing in mind all the assurances that he and his colleagues have given—how it is that he has not asked his colleagues to take their choice between the offices they hold under his control and the offices they have accepted in the Cabinet of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham.

One point we must always bear in mind is this—that this is not a matter which admits of long delay. It is an urgent and vital matter, The country is perplexed and disquieted by the enigmas of the Prime Minister's statesmanship. Let it be borne in mind that it is not a mere speculative, sentimental, academic, or partial question. It is universal; it is instant; it is intensely actual; and it is confusing and hampering the trade of the country. The men who carry on the commerce and the great industries in this country are entitled to some consideration at the hands of those who have proposed to save them from the horrors of free trade. They are entitled to know on which shore it is proposed to land them when they have escaped from drowning, and what will be the means employed for their resuscitation—whether the humble means of the Prime Minister or the more heroic processes of the right hon. Member for Birmingham. But the trade of the country cannot wait for whatever may follow upon the next election, or the next election but one, or the next election but two. Contracts are being entered into. Capital is being invested, and business must be carried on. It cannot suspend its operations until the dialectical complications of the situation, so fascinating to certain minds have been made intelligible to the mass of the people. While politicians scheme and dialecticians refine, trade suffers.

But has the House observed another aspect of the case? The Prime Minister has proffered his sympathy, and certain of his colleagues have given more than their sympathy, their active co-operation. In what spirit has it been accepted? Does the president of the reconstituted Liberal Unionist Association take it as a contribution to his fund of ideals and aspirations, or does he seek something much more tangible? He acknowledges its receipt, not in the spirit of philosophic detachment, but as the president of this fighting association. He says—

"We, the Liberal Unionists of the country, appeal to our Government,"

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

and the word suggests a proprietorship which I daresay was not immediately intended—

"We do not dictate to them. We have no such presumption. We appeal to our Government, and we promise them our support if they will march in front of us to victory."

But when is the march to begin? Is it to begin at the next election, or at an election further on? And where are they to be taken to when the time comes? Evidently one thing is certain—they must go. There is an old saying—and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not object to the comparison, which at least does full justice to his power—"Needs must when the devil drives." A few days later at Stafford House the right hon. Gentleman spoke again as president of the Tariff Reform League.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I am not president.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Well, as one having something to do with the league. The league on that occasion was said to be engaged in perfecting the work of Mr. Cobden by bringing the Anti-Corn Law League up to date. Said the right hon. Gentleman—

"We are more fortunate than Mr. Cobden. We have always enjoyed the sympathy of the Prime Minister and his colleagues. I wish it had been a little more than sympathy; but everything comes to him who stands and waits."

The right hon. Gentleman has his own ideas of standing and waiting. To the outer view of a plain person like me it seems that there is very little standing in it and still less waiting. It makes us wonder what the measure of the right hon. Gentleman's activities will be when something more than sympathy arrives from the Government, and he begins to get into motion. The right hon. Gentleman improved this placid interval for standing and waiting. The other day a dinner was given to him by his Parliamentary supporters. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] The Gentlemen who were present have such agreeable recollections of it that they cannot withhold a cheer. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire was in the chair, and he did a rather unusual thing—he proceeded to count noses—to count the heads of his guests, and to separate the sheep—that is, those who were at the banquet—from the goats—that is, all the Unionist Members who happened to be dining somewhere else. He found 200 guests present, either in the body or in the spirit, leaving a balance, as he said, of 148. He omitted the Ministers. He was sure of them. There were 148 who, he said, were free-traders or sitters on the fence; and then at the meeting of the Tariff Reform League the right hon. Member for West Birmingham took full advantage of these figures. After dilating on the sympathy of the Prime Minister and his colleagues, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We have the support of 200 Members of the House of Commons. We have the aid of the most influential portion of the Press. We have the enthusiastic approval of the vast majority of the Liberal Unionist Party."

Why, what more need the right hon. Gentleman stand and wait for? No impartial person can doubt that he at least does not see any great difference between the support of the followers and the sympathy of the leaders. But then what becomes of the defence that the sympathy is only academic, and that office-bearing in the council of the Liberal Unionist Association is non-committal? At the next general election the right hon. Gentleman will set his forces in order to help forward his policy of food taxes and preferential tariffs, boasting of the Prime Minister's support, counting the Prime Minister's colleagues as his colleagues, and he will have his 200 Parliamentary supporters for his army. But, on the other hand, what have we? The Prime Minister dangling before the country his *dilettante* Sheffield policy, which no one understands, and which no one cares for, and making believe that that is the issue before the country, although, no doubt, he will be ready to send encouraging messages to the Birmingham candidates as he did the other day at Oswestry. Why, Sir, what difference can plain men find between sympathy and support when that day arrives? It will all be the same thing. The truth is that the Government's tenure of office has been, and is being, used for the purpose of sapping and undermining the fiscal system of this country. And the machinations and manœuvres and finesses of the session prove it.

On three occasions in this session we have tried to get a guarantee that the leaders of the Party opposite will abstain from committing their Party to protection and preferences. We had, first, the Amendment to the Address of the right hon. Member for Montrose, which talked of the removal of the protectionist duties being a great advantage to the country, and said that their restoration would be a fatal injury. Then we had the Motion of the hon. Member for Aberdeen condemning protection and preferential tariffs and blaming those Ministers who favoured them. Thus we tried blame. Then came my hon. friend the Member for Banffshire, who, thinking that praise might soften the Government, moved a Resolution welcoming the declarations of Ministers in a contrary sense. But what happened? The first was negatived by a point-blank vote against free trade; though there was no doubt the convenient cover of the Address; and any one who was in the least conscience stricken could say that he had voted against an Amendment to the Address and not on the merits of the question. As to the Motion of the hon Member for Aberdeen, Ministers refused to condemn preferences under a protectionist tariff. We had the episode of the Wharton Amendment, which approved of the explicit declarations of His Majesty's Ministers that their policy did not include either preference or taxation of food. But the Wharton Amendment was dropped at the command of the Government and out of deference to the protectionists. What did that mean? It meant that the Government would have been beaten if they had carried their explicit declarations to the length of the division lobby. Then we had my hon. friend the Member for Banffshire welcoming the assurance, and the Government themselves then moving a vote of confidence in themselves, and voting that discussion of the subject was altogether unnecessary. What weight attaches to assurances given in a free-trade sense when Ministers and their supporters follow them by giving votes recorded to all intents and purposes in favour of protection? What authority are we to assign to the declared policy of the Government when the most they do is to declare that it is inexpedient to discuss it? While they have not hesitated to give their votes against any condemnation or repudiation of the Birmingham scheme, they have never yet come forward like men to carry out the Sheffield policy — though it happens to be the very policy which the Prime Minister informed the Duke of Devonshire in a memorable letter the Administration was constructed on purpose to carry out. The conclusion is that a thing so fragile as this Government's Sheffield policy, so fragile that it cannot be avowed or discussed, still less be put into operation, is not seriously put forward as a policy at all, but must be relegated to the category of political shams and fictions. Who could be enthusiastic over a policy of pretence? The Prime Minister himself professes no enthusiasm for his own policy. His sympathies are with the Member for Birmingham. He told us so long ago. He told us that he has only refrained from advocating it because his countrymen, in their dull, stupid way, were not ripe to receive it. He has never suggested that he would not be an unwilling worker in the field when the sheaves are to be gathered in, and the harvest is ripe.

I turn from him to his colleagues. One of them, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, accepts the Birmingham policy in all its branches. The Colonial Secretary said at Leamington on 26th January, we should sooner or later certainly come to colonial preferences: that is, if we began by revising our fiscal system on the Sheffield lines. Thirdly, the Irish Secretary on 28th October, insisted "that you must have that method or another method. The thing has got to be done." What is the thing? The thing is the fiscal unity of the Empire. The Home Secretary, on 19th January, says that he feels certain "that it will be possible, by an alteration in the duties imposed to get a solution of this question" —that is, the condition of agriculture— "which would confer benefit upon all classes in this country and which in the aggregate would not raise the cost of living to the citizens of this great country." We all know what that points to. It points straight to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham. That is the Home Secretary's view as an individual. But for a short time he appeared on that Bench as the chosen representative of the Government, and in that capacity he told this House on the eve of a momentous division that the Government were opposed to food taxes and even to those particularly lucrative taxes which are to put money into the pockets of the consumer. The anthology might be extended to any extent. No one is called to account. It is perfectly proper for the men who said these things on platforms to repudiate them on behalf of the Ministry in this House. And if a Minister is opposed to protection and speaks out he is told, as the President of the Board of Trade was told by the Member for Partick, that his speech on behalf of the Government was a mere interim report and that it is not in the power—these are the words—"of any one to say what the issues of the general election will be, and that no declarations now made could hinder the Prime Minister or the Party from going to the country on the larger policy of Imperial consolidation and preference to the Colonies, if and when it seemed to them expedient to do so." So we are told that not only may the pledges and assurances of Ministers be cynically contradictory of each other, but, whatever they are, they are of no binding effect whatever. I say, enough of this pitable spectacle, for pitiable it is. This is playing with the country. It is treating the trade and prosperity of the country as mere counters in the squalid game of political ambition. It is destructive of the constitutional theory of Ministerial responsibility. It is degrading to Parliament. It puts an end to the old frank and candid relations which obtained when Governments avowed their policies and acted up to them. It is chaos and anarchy introduced into our public life. If ever censure was called for it is here; if ever a vote of censure was justified it is now; and I am happy to be the man to move it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House regrets that certain of His Majesty's Ministers have accepted official positions in a political organisation which has formally declared its adhesion to a policy of Preferential Duties involving the taxation of food."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): When I came down to the House this afternoon it was not in the anticipation of speaking, but my noble friends Lord Lansdowne and Lord Selborne are not present; they are office-bearers in the Liberal Unionist Association; and I do not wish to separate myself for one instant from them. If I had been asked to be an office-bearer in the Liberal Unionist Association I most certainly would have accepted. [Opposition cries of "It is not too late."] Inasmuch as my noble friends are absent, I desire to say a few sentences in answer to the attack which has just been made upon them. I do not profess at any time to be able to rival the Leader of the Opposition in neat and pointed wit; but I listened for an argument in his speech directed against my noble friends and myself, and I trust that I do not err in respect to him when I say that the argument which he has addressed to the House leaves very little for me to say in reply. He has spoken of the finesse and the subtlety that it requires to maintain the position which His Majesty's Government have maintained through three or four votes of censure this session upon this subject. I confess that I must disown altogether such qualities myself, and that I can see absolutely no reason for their possession to defend actions such as were taken by my noble friends and myself, they in accepting the office and myself in speaking on the occasion of the meeting of the Liberal Unionists.

I have always taken this position for myself, and I think my noble friends have taken it also. We have said that we entirely agree with the Prime Minister's policy of retaliation, and in saying that we sympathise with the ideal of colonial preference. I would ask the House, is it seemly, is it fitting and right, that when the Colonies have gone the distance which they have gone—[Cries of "What distance?"]—in according to us preferential duties and in actually carrying out the policy which they brought forward by formal resolution in 1902—would it be right to say no; although they, the great self-governing Colonies of the Empire, have come forward and not only approved of this policy but given genuine earnest of their determination to carry it out—this policy, advocated by a great Minister for Colonial Affairs, who knows the Colonies better than any man in this House, must be ruled out of the programme of the Party for all time, and that not merely at the present moment, but even after the next election we must say that our minds are not open even for discussion of the topic? I might have cited the most distinguished Member of the other side in another place, Lord Rosebery, as one who at this time, if he has not given a clear expression of sympathy with that policy, has at all events gone a very long way in that direction. [Cries of "When?"] I do not think I should be very far off the mark if I were to say that some of the right hon. Members opposite have also indicated leanings in that direction. If that is so, why should my noble friend and myself refuse to become office-bearers or to speak at a meeting where a resolution is proposed with every word of which we are in entire sympathy, simply because it is proposed by a body which has to deal with the question of the unity of the Empire at home? Why should not we go and do that which I now do for the last time this session, implore those on our side of politics not to shut the door to an aspiration which I have never denied from the first presented in carrying out great difficulties of method and detail, but which is a great aspiration and worthy of acceptance? The right hon. Gentleman has not read the resolution to which Lord Lansdowne and I spoke, but some other resolution.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This was the afternoon resolution.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I daresay it was. It is remarkable that the right hon. Gentleman should select the resolution moved at the afternoon meeting, which was not attended by the Ministers who have been referred to, and should abstain from reading the resolution passed at the evening meeting, which they did attend. The right hon. Gentleman has endeavoured to extricate himself from the precedents afforded by the National Union of Conservative Associations, which passed resolutions entirely different from the policy which was the immediate policy of the Party to which it belonged. I accept the right hon. Gentleman's description of the resolutions passed by private members of that association in the morning as evidences of the tendency of opinion. If the right hon. Gentleman considered that Lord Salisbury was right in speaking in the evening after resolutions in favour of protection had been passed by the union, how can he have the face to ask the House to censure men who went to an evening meeting of an association which had passed a resolution——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow me to point out that he did not casually drop into the meeting in the evening? The Ministers of whom we are speaking were appointed vice-presidents of this association, and we know that the right hon. Gentleman claims it as the same continuous Liberal Unionist Association. Perhaps he will then explain why it is that the Duke of Devonshire left it.

MR. LYTTELTON: The right hon. Gentleman has not drawn a very effective distinction. Lord Salisbury was president of the National Union of Conservative Associations. I entirely fail to understand how he can possibly differentiate the two cases. [An HON. MEMBER: Lord Salisbury repudiated the resolution.] It has been said, or implied, that the action of the Prime Minister in this matter has been ambiguous. unintelligible, and unstraightforward. It is not necessary that I should say a word to those on this side of the House with regard to the straightforwardness of the Prime Minister. Right hon. Gentlemen opposite think they perceive a difference—and I admit that there is a difference of opinion on this subject among the supporters of the Government. They wish to widen the cleavage, and that is the reason of the step they are now taking. It is simply a move in the Party game. My right hon. friend's speech at Sheffield was perfectly clear. I ask any man not an imbecile to say whether it was not a perfectly intelligible and unambiguous statement. The Prime Minister stated his policy with regard to retaliation, and he stated his sympathy with the idea of colonial preference, but said he would not pursue that policy during the present Parliament. He said, in perfectly plain English, that in regard to a policy which might involve the taxation of the food of the people he considered public opinion was not ripe, and that, as the leader of the Conservative Party, it was not his duty to go forward with that proposal. although in its main outline he expressed sympathy with it—an expression of sympathy which was repeated by Lord Lansdowne on his behalf at the Albert Hall. Hon. Gentlemen cheer that statement very loudly. Is it an ambiguous statement? Is it unintelligible? [An HON. MEMBER: It is quite clear now.] How does that summary differ from the Prime Minister's utterance at Sheffield, of which the right hon. Gentleman, notwithstanding the manner in which he has characterised it, has not been able to read a single passage as being ambiguous, unintelligible, or unstraightforward. If objection is raised to my citing only Conservative precedents, I would ask what is the position of the right hon. Gentleman himself with regard to some very important questions of policy. The other day the right hon. Gentleman, after denouncing for many weeks a certain policy in Africa as slavery, or something akin to slavery, was challenged as to what he would do in regard to that question when he came into office, and replied, "Put me in and I will tell you." Can you imagine a better instance of the view that Ministers are concerned only with the policy which is declared to be theirs, and not with some indefinite future. Burning with indignation on this subject, the right hon. Gentleman is unwilling to pledge himself before the general election takes place.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton E.): Sir Robert Peel on one occasion said he would prescribe when he was called in.

MR. LYTTELTON: I think these two instances justify the course which the Prime Minister has taken. I would ask one further Question: What is the position of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to Home Rule? Is that a question which has or has not been amply discussed, and on which hon. Gentlemen opposite ought to be in a position to make up their minds? I think any candid man would say that an hon. Gentleman ought to have a definite and permanent opinion on that topic now, when he might well be excused, having regard to the enormous complexity of the subject, if he said he approved of the principle of colonial preference. I admit that there are many points of detail and method which require most careful and minute examination. Of course the right hon. Gentleman has exhausted his speech; but I would have liked immensely if, after sixteen or seventeen years discussion of Home Rule, he would have got up in his place and given us definitely his opinion in regard to that subject. Possibly my curiosity in that respect might have been gratified by the right hon. Gentleman; but there are some of his colleagues whose opinions on that matter it would be particularly interesting to hear. If that were so—(I am not blaming hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite in the least—it would be impertinent for me to do so)—what I say is this: is it not rather remarkable, to put it no higher that those who differ fundamentally between themselves—as we all know they do, notwithstanding what they may say—on such points as that, should take up this attitude against the present Government, when we know perfectly well that the raising of that point, directly they came into power, would be a matter which would cause a schism in their ranks. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no!"] I hear some not responsible Gentlemen say "No." Will any responsible Gentleman here, in this debate, get up and say that in any policy of that kind he would commit his Party to it? Notwithstanding what they may say, they have fundamental differences. I do not blame them for it. Any person who has acquaintance with the history of politics in this country in former times, as well as at the present moment, who asked himself this question and expected to receive a candid answer, would say, "Are there not many topics upon which it is impossible for any body of gentlemen to act together without very long debate on the subject, and unless, what everybody admits there cannot possibly be at present, the subject is ripe and fit to bring before the actual Parliament of the time?" There must be hundreds of such subjects. One such is Home Rule, another such is Disestablishment, and I freely admit another such is that which my right hon. friend has proposed in regard to colonial preferences. These are subjects that must be before the country for some considerable time. You have to get them into the sphere of action; but until you can have that actual opinion upon them, it is absolutely vain and hopeless to suppose that there can be other than some degree of liberty, even for members of the Government, for expression of views on such a topic. I thank the House for having heard me so patiently. I ask the House to reject this Motion, and to reject it, I may say, as not a very serious Motion on the present occasion.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said many hon. Members must have been astonished at the extraordinary speech they had just heard from the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary on the subject of colonial preferences. The right hon. Gentleman began by describing the distance that the Colonies had come in the direction of colonial preference. He observed a slight but very significant change of phraseology in relation to that mythical colonial offer. Now, the Colonies, at some distance, had power to make an approach to the mother country, but was that a distance which they traversed with any idea whatever of promoting protection, even in the mother country? It was perfectly well known to all who had watched colonial politics that the movement in favour of so-called preference to the mother country was essentially a free-trade movement. It was an endeavour by the free-trade Party in the Colonies, who, finding themselves unable to introduce free trade as a whole, hoped at least to procure some measure of it by the aid of Imperial sentiment. And what the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had done was to turn that movement—which was a growing movement, and which would have more and more increased the relations between the Colonies and this country on terms advantageous to both—into a protectionist movement. But the Colonial Secretary asked them whether it would be decent to refuse discussion of the offer which he implied that the Colonies had made. He went further, and said that he himself approved colonial preference, and in another phrase, which he believed would be carefully noted, the right hon. Gentleman pledged not merely his own sympathy with the policy which admittedly involved the taxation of food, but pledged the sympathy of the Prime Minister to that policy. That was a statement which he had heard with surprise, because at the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary's own re-election—which was conducted on the general lines of the Party, and, therefore, his responsibility for what was done at it could not be wholly ignored, although, from circumstances over which the right hon. Gentleman had no control, he took no active part in it—was it not a fact that the right hon. Gentleman's constituency was placarded, and that every dead wall lived, with the assertion that it was a lie to say that he was in favour of the taxation of food. And was there anyone on the Opposition Benches who had not at one time or another been accused of misrepresentation, because they had said it was their belief—now apparently justified by the speech of the Colonial Secretary—that the Prime Minister, in spite of all the twists and turnings of his subtle speech was also in favour of the taxation of food?

Not long ago the Prime Minister, in a moment of inadvertence, referred to himself as being among those who favoured colonial preference. Perhaps there was a little inadvertence in the speech of the Colonial Secretary that afternoon. Blessed was inadvertence! It was the only thing, in certain conditions, which gave the truth a chance. They had got the truth at last; and they would not grumble at its having come inadvertently. This was another example of the danger of purely extemporaneous speech. The Colonial Secretary then referred to the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to Home Rule. Again hon. Members had heard that point brought up as if it afforded a complete parallel. He would tell the House what would be a complete parallel between the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to Home Rule and the conduct of the Prime Minister on the fiscal question. It would be a complete parallel if the Leader of the Opposition, when in office, denounced Home Rule, and then sent two or three of his colleagues to make a bargain with the Irish Party in its favour or to join the Home Rule movement.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Is the hon. and learned Gentleman going to denounce Home Rule?

MR. ROBSON said that if the right hon. Gentleman would do him the favour to listen to his remarks, he was endeavouring to establish that it would be a complete parallel if the Leader of the Opposition approved Home Rule and then sent two of his colleagues to join the Liberal Unionist Association. But he would pass to what seemed most vital in this debate. The conduct of those Ministers who had joined this association was of minor importance, and its main interest consisted in the indication it gave of the views of the Prime Minister. When Lord Lansdowne and Lord Selborne joined the Liberal Unionist Association it was to be assumed that they did so with the assent of the Prime Minister. What did that assent involve? Did it show that he approved of their conduct? They knew that the right hon. Gentleman had encouraged the most diverse and contradictory views on the part of his followers in regard to his own convictions. Some of his followers would vote for him in that debate, because they thought that at least he had given assurances on fiscal freedom of trade adequate to satisfy the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol. Others would vote for him with better reason, because they saw him in active, avowed, and sympathetic co-operation with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the preference Party. The right hon. Gentleman said, "Never mind what my sympathies are; never mind what my intentions are in regard to the future of the country. You are only concerned with my immediate programme, and my immediate programme excludes the taxation of food and preference." But they were entitled to know from the Prime Minister whether he intended to exclude that programme from the consideration of the electors, when he again invited their confidence. Was it to be the issue, the main substantial issue, at the next general election? The right hon. Gentleman indulged in a display of academic didactics; but the elections would not be academic elections. Were the by-elections academic elections? Why, not a single protectionist candidate had yet escaped the right hon. Gentleman's blessing; and a very unfortunate blessing it seemed to be in some instances. He would go further and say that the right hon. Gentleman was bound to tell the House in frank and plain terms what he meant to do at the next general election in regard to this question. He would remind the House that the right hon. Gentleman's partner in this combination in favour of colonial preference told the country what the right hon. Gentleman meant to do. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham at Tynemouth pledged not only himself but the Prime Minister to lay this question before the country at the next general election. He said—

> "We claim that the matter must be discussed in all its branches; and therefore it was that Mr. Balfour, in making his speech at Sheffield, and I myself, in making a speech at Birmingham, pointed out to the people of this country what were the tremendous issues which were now placed in their hands, and implored them to consider them before the next general election."

That was a very significant observation on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and one which had not yet received that attention it deserved. It made an end of all the talk about the fiscal question in this form being outside the range of practical politics. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister intended to bring it within the range of practical politics; and he had no right to evade discussion on it by treating it as if it were outside the range of practical politics. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the Prime Minister were at one in their determination to make this the vital question at the next election; how, therefore, could it be treated as outside the range of practical politics? Yet the Prime Minister at Sheffield excused himself for not dealing with the taxation of food, knowing, of course, that if he did it would bring him into controversial conflict with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. The right hon. Gentleman excused himself on the ground that it was outside the range of practical politics. He hoped the House would remember the Cabinet revelations of the noble Lord the Member for Ealing. The noble Lord told them that a few weeks before the Prime Minister went down to Sheffield to treat this question as being outside the pale of practical politics he had, in some mysterious document, submitted this very question to the Cabinet for practical and immediate consideration. There was only an interval of two or three weeks between the two events. He would ask the House and the country to note carefully the juxtaposition of the dates. How could a question which was worthy of immediate Cabinet consideration at the beginning of the month be, at the end of the month, merely an academic problem? If the closeness of the dates were considered, they would get some light on what the right hon. Gentleman's admirers were fond of calling his strategy. Strategy was a very fine thing, and it had its own legitimate sphere in political life: but this strategy, as applied to controversial arguments, was perilously near to what was popularly, usefully, and accurately described as misrepresentation. He did not like the use of the word strategy, nor was it very common in this connection. However, they must accept it. They knew what the aim of this strategy was. It was to lure free-traders into voting for a protectionist Ministry, who had devised a policy, protectionist as far as it went, in order to facilitate a further advance in the direction of protection. He did not like this kind of strategy. It seemed to him to cut at the very root of political argument, and the Prime Minister was one of the last which many of them would have expected to stoop to it. He wondered what would have been said by the right hon. Gentleman or his Party if any of the right hon. Gentleman's distinguished predecessors—Mr. Gladstone, for instance—had had recourse to this sort of device in order to facilitate the progress of a policy. Why, the Tory Party would have exhausted the English language for epithets; and the very worst epithet would have at least one merit, it would have been accurate.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham rejoiced in the sympathy of the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol also rejoiced in what he believed to be the sympathy of the Prime Minister. Which of the right hon. Gentlemen was right? He thought they could decide that for themselves by the application of a very simple case. Let them suppose that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was beaten at the polls, as he was fairly reasonably certain of being. Let them suppose—it was only a hypothesis—that the Prime Minister was successful at the polls, and that he brought back a majority of the House pledged to some measure of the policy of retaliation. What would happen then (and to this he would invite the attention of the free-trade Unionists)? The policy of retaliation was frequently referred to as if it were some sort of compromise. In the admirable speech to which they had listened with such delight from the Leader of the Opposition, his right hon. friend perhaps too readily accepted for the purpose of his argument the view that the policy of retaliation was a middle policy—something less extreme than the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. He ventured to say it was a more extreme policy. It might perhaps be not so insidious; but it was far more dangerous. Yet, the Leader of the Opposition was right in treating it as a policy put forward as a halfway-house policy. That was the way it was desired by those who put it forward that it should be taken. But it was in fact a most dangerous policy. De Quincy started the autobiography of some imaginary criminal by saying—

> "I began my career with manslaughter, of which I thought very little or nothing at the time."

The Prime Minister now proposed to begin with a tariff war or two, of which he thought little or nothing. There was nothing more dangerous than a tariff war. It began in one country, but it was bound to be carried into other countries, because the susceptibilities and the alarm of other countries would be aroused. What he wished to discuss, however, was the way in which the policy of retaliation would be worked by the right hon. Gentleman's majority. Who would dictate the spirit in which it was to proceed? They all knew very well that the Party the right hon. Gentleman would bring back would be in heart and spirit and belief a protectionist Party. The Tory Party had never been anything else. They had altered their policy during the last sixty years; but they had never for a moment altered their convictions. They were protectionists now, and they would be protectionists if they were again returned. They would try retaliation at once, but who would inspire their policy? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. He would see that the Prime Minister worked retaliation in a protectionist spirit. The position of the Prime Minister reminded him of the lines in "The Ancient Mariner"—

> "Like one that on a lonesome road,
> Doth walk in fear and dread,
> And having once turned round, walks on,
> And turns no more his head,
> Because he knows a frightful fiend
> Doth close behind him tread."

The Prime Minister would have to march, and that was the spirit in which he would march. A great many free-trade Unionists hugged to themselves the belief that after all the right hon. Gentleman did not mean it, that he would drop retaliation just as he had dropped old-age pensions. It was comparatively easy to deceive the people; but it was not so easy to deceive the class the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had gathered together, and from whom he had taken large and secret subscriptions—secret because they did not desire that the contributions which they gave for the taxes they were going to get should be known. Retaliation would not be dropped. He would do the Prime Minister the justice of saying that he did not think the right hon. Gentleman meant to drop it.

The vital part of this controversy was, What were the real convictions of the Prime Minister? The historic and now almost antiquated volume, "Economic Notes on Insular Free Trade," which the right hon. Gentleman published, ought in itself to enlighten every free-trade Unionist. They would discover there was not a single fundamental proposition of protection that the right hon. Gentleman did not hold, and they would also find there was not a single fundamental proposition of free trade of which he did not disapprove. First of all, the Prime Minister treated as inadequate and incorrect the idea that it was probably better for economic tendencies to follow their natural course than to substitute for them a State-contrived scheme and artificial action by the Government. Economic tendencies were nothing but the tendencies pursued by men in their own interests, and in the view of the Prime Minister it was better that business men should not be allowed to pursue the search for their own interest with unfettered freedom but that the State should take it up for them. It would be better, in the right hon Gentleman's opinion, to leave their interests in the hands of a statesman, for instance, who placed a tax of 50 per cent. on the wholesale value of an article and declared that it would not affect the price. The right hon. Gentleman had also expounded the doctrine that to sell to our customers things which added to their productive power and capacity was a pernicious thing. There was no doubt that that was protection in its very essential conception. It was in the interest of every class of trader to make his interest universal. But the Prime Minister further suggested all he dared against foreign investments, in a way that he should like to place before the Stock Exchange. In short, the right hon. Gentleman wished to substitute for our present world-wide business some smaller area, while free-traders desired to have nothing less wide than the world itself. When protectionists talked about a self-sufficient Empire they were really proposing to destroy our national trade, without which our Empire would not retain its strength or integrity for twelve months. On each of these fundamental propositions the Prime Minister was at one with the protectionists. Now it was all clear. The Liberal Party would go to the country with the perfectly clear understanding that the Premier was in favour of a policy which involved the taxation of food.

*MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said it was very natural that the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down, as well as the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, should in their addresses to the House attempt to make capital of the differences which, in their opinion, existed among the various members of the Unionist Party. Anyone must have noticed that, particularly from the latter portion of the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman. He did not say that the question of protection could be regarded as an irrelevant from the particular Motion raised by the right hon. Gentleman, but it only arose in the second degree, and it was going outside the terms of the Resolution to discuss at large words said to be used on various occasions either by the Prime Minister or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham.

He did not appreciate what the hon. and learned Member had said on the question of protection; he did not agree that the selfish competition, as the hon. Member had called it, was the last word to be said either morally or economically, on any great trading question. He went so far as to say that competition in excess was morally wholly unjustifiable and economically wholly wasteful. The question had always been. and would always be, not a matter of mere abstract doctrine, but whether, under particular conditions, and having regard to the social conditions of the country, the Government was justified in interfering more or less with business relations. There was the illustration of the factory legislation which was intended to protect the children of this country, but which would have been entirely inconsistent with the only test the hon. and learned Member would apply, namely, the opinion of business men. It was a Whiggish archaism to go back and say that anyone who opposed the extreme doctrine of *laissez faire*, that anybody who admitted a policy of limitation on this question, had adopted either the theory of protection or some of the other reactionary theories that the hon. and learned Gentleman referred to. Free trade was founded on the doctrine of the whole world being one industrial entity, and if the whole world were one industrial entity it was to the interest of the community at large that the industrial powers in the aggregate should be utilised to the greatest advantage. If the premises of the extreme view held by Mr. Cobden could be established, no one would be a more earnest supporter than he of the Cobdenite view; but it was best in dealing with a business matter to recognise that the Cobden doctrine had not been established, and that in place of one industrial entity we at present had separate industrial entities raising tariffs for the purpose of protecting their own industries and injuring the trade of this country.

He had no desire to dogmatise upon this matter, but supposing he could prove to the hon. and learned Gentleman, or any other hon. Member opposite, that under existing conditions we were not getting fair treatment as regarded our industrial interests in this country, would it not be only reasonable that we should insure, as far as we could, that our industries and our working men should not be unfairly handicapped? That they should have fair if not free competition, which was the nearest we could get to the ideal of Mr. Cobden? It was no good putting considerations of fact on one side; it was no use to talk of "natural conditions," which did not exist at the present moment. He could not agree with those who, as he understood, would, under the form of this doctrine, have us tie our hands and so restrain ourselves as not to be able to insist on fair competition in trade with other countries. He doubted whether the Unionist free-traders were really so much in antagonism with those who on this subject appeared to differ from them. Supposing they were satisfied that as regards one of the great industries of this country we were suffering under a disadvantage owing to the action of some foreign competition, and that we could get rid of that disadvantage by a system of retaliation, would they, under those circumstances, say "Perish justice to our industry, in order that free trade may be preserved." He could not imagine a more deadly way of approaching the industrial questions of a great country than to go on an abstract theory of that kind, hypnotising ourselves as to the actual conditions of everyday life, allowing industries to suffer under unfair conditions, and debarring ourselves from taking the natural way of devising a remedy. This merely because there was brought forward an abstract theory, admirable in itself, but not applicable to the present conditions of industrial competition.

But what were the real issues raised by this vote of censure. He realised that a vote of censure was a Party move, and it would be quixotic in this House to blame people for taking advantage of Party moves of this description; but he did hold that whatever might be the result of immediate elections or of the next general election, it was far more important for a great Party to say what they thought was true and right on this fiscal question, than to be governed by such passing considerations as the results of the next division or the next election. It could not be held that the doctrine of the collective responsibility of Ministers was applicable to a question which, at the moment, was not within the purview or area of practical politics. Could there be a more fatal way of preventing some of the most acute and statesmanlike minds in the country from approaching the consideration of problems which must, in the first instance, be fought out in the abstract before they could be discussed in their practical bearings? Moreover, such a proposition was absolutely inconsistent with constitutional doctrine and precedent. Was Canning debarred from stating his views on Catholic disabilities by the fact that the Government with which he was connected was opposed to him? Was Lord Palmerston debarred from expressing his views on such questions as the ballot and the reform of representation at a time when a large number of his Government were avowedly working in the opposite direction? The constitutional principle was that in matters of immediate concern there must be collective Ministerial responsibility, but as regarded matters outside immediate practical politics there was and there ought to be no rule by which statesmen would be prevented from dealing with questions which were often more important than immediate politics, and upon which the future of the Empire might in the long run depend.

The Resolution submitted by the Leader of the Opposition might be divided into two parts: one dealt with preferential duties, and the other with the taxation of food. It was true that as regarded the question of Imperial solidarity there might be two schools. There were those who believed that true political union was impossible without first establishing commercial union. That was the view expressed by the Prime Minister at Sheffield, and held, he believed, by the great majority of the Unionist and Conservative Party in the country. Starting from that premiss, what was the next question? He did not commit himself personally to the suggestion that the preferential duties necessary to constitute commercial union would necessitate the taxation of food. Taxation of food in one sense we had always had in this country; it was not to be connected with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, or with one particular Party, or with one particular Budget. The only alternative to some form of taxation of food was a graduated income-tax much larger than had ever yet been levied—a proposition to which no Party had ever committed itself. But that was not the question. The supporters of this view held that they could bring about this commercial union which they so ardently desired between the mother country and her colonies, without adding one farthing, either directly or indirectly, to the budget of the poor man. Supposing it could be proved beyond doubt that by a re-adjustment of taxation for the purpose of colonial preference the burdens on the poor man would be not greater than before, could the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite raise a theoretical objection and say, "However much I believe that commercial union is a condition precedent to closer political union, I would sacrifice the Empire rather than have any readjustment of the kind, although it might be a benefit to the working man."

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) asked whether the hon. and learned Member had any such scheme in his mind?

*__Mr. CRIPPS__ said that not only had he such a scheme in his mind, but it had been proved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham that by such a readjustment of taxation as would be sufficient for carrying out the commercial union, the working man would be relieved to a certain extent from burdens which now affected him. He was rather surprised that the hon. Member for Oldham should be led away by prejudice upon a question of this kind. The proposition he had just put forward had been proved by statistics. And was not that what had to be done? If we were to hold out our hands to the Colonies, and the Colonies were to come into commercial union with this country, ought not statesmen to see whether it could be done without adding to the burdens of the people? It was no good falling back upon prejudice and appealing to the working man on topics of prejudice. He (the speaker) did not believe there was one word of truth in what had been said over and over again on that point. If there was one matter worth working for or one subject outside the ordinary run of political life it was the necessity of finding a permanent and solid foundation for the relationship between the mother country and the Colonies. It was upon those lines that the Conservative and Unionist Party were agreed. The question of means and methods was one upon which they might well differ. He found no fault with those who thought that at present the solution had not been found. But let them not go off the real point of the discussion. Let them realise where they agreed and discuss fairly and openly the points of difference which might arise.

With regard to the "free-fooders" as against free-trade Unionists, he understood that they concentrated their views upon the question of free food. Having assented to the taxation of sugar and tea, they could not object to the taxation of food. It was a mere commonplace to say that they desired to keep that taxation as low as possible. They objected not to the taxation of food, but to what they called the "protective" taxation of food. In other words, they were willing to tax sugar and tea, but unwilling to tax corn, because in the one case the theory of protection did not arise, whereas in the latter case it did. But what by itself was a protective duty was not a protective duty if a corresponding Excise was levied. They objected to protective taxation on food because further taxation was not put upon the agricultural industry. If such a tax were put upon the agricultural industry, their objection, so far as protection, would go, and as regarded taxation on food, they had assented to it as one of the necessary methods for raising the enormous revenue which was necessary for the government of this country.

Let them discuss this question on its true lines, and make up their minds whether they wanted an Imperially consolidated Empire or not. If they were in favour of further colonial solidarity, and if they had a conference between British and colonial statesmen, could anyone doubt that it was within the power of statesmen to solve this question in a way which would throw no burden upon the working men of this country or those living in any other part of our Colonial Empire. Those who supported the present policy in its main lines as put forward by the right hon. Gentlemen the Colonial Secretary and the Prime Minister, thought they could not have an Empire upon a permanent footing unless they had commercial union. Let them, as a Party, work for that great ideal, and do not let them be frightened by mere abstract propositions and doctrines hurled at them from the other side of the House. He was considered to have taken rather a Tory view on many questions, but he was not so Tory as to bring forward a fossilised reactionary doctrine and attempt to hypnotise the country as to the real issue, and on those grounds to oppose every step which ought to be taken at this moment to promote some great scheme of colonial solidarity. They knew that they had the sympathy and loyalty of their colonial subjects at the prseent moment. He hoped that under the Prime Minister's guidance the result of this policy would be a work worthy of their Party and a great statesmanlike work which would put in the end our colonial dependencies on a solid and permanent basis to the benefit of the whole civilised world.

Mr. ELLIOT (Durham) said his hon. and learned friend had said that a great edifice was going to be constructed upon which a great Empire was going to be built, but he invited the House to look at the foundations upon which it was proposed to build. When he did that he found to his astonishment that his hon. and learned friend would build this great Imperialism upon the taxation of bread in the United Kingdom itself, because a tax on corn was a tax on bread.

Mr. CRIPPS said that there must be a readjustment of taxation that would not affect the budget of the working man. He did not think that it would be necessary to tax either bread or food.

Mr. ELLIOT said that was not the policy which had been placed before the country by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. His hon. and learned friend had said that the differences between Unionists were only skin deep, but he viewed with the greatest dislike and absolute disbelief the financial principles upon which it was proposed to draw together the whole Empire, and to draw mighty revenues which would come from Heaven knows where. He confessed that he was a little disappointed when he heard the Colonial Secretary speak of what was happening that day as a mere move in the Party game. In politics there were always two Parties, and discussions would always assume a more or less Party aspect, but his right hon. friend would be woefully mistaken if he thought the discussion which was taking place not only in the House of Commons but in every town and city in the country was based merely upon Party considerations and Party lines. It was nothing of the kind. They had not been asked to insist that every Minister and servant of the King should have precisely the same views upon every question which might not be ripe for immediate settlement, and when the hon. and learned Member spoke of the open-mindedness of the present Government upon this question, where was the evidence of it? Where were the free-traders who were members of His Majesty's Government? It appeared to him that it was not open to a free-trader to be a member of the Government unless he chose to keep his free-trade principles to himself and advocate them only in the sanctity of his own bosom and the privacy of his own room. Many members of the Government had given expositions of their views which would be extremely palatable to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. He had seen letter after letter written by one Minister after another urging the electors to support protectionist candidates, but he had not seen from any member of this open-minded Government any letters in favour of free-trade candidates. The Cabinet had been broken up upon this very question. Instead of treating this as an open question when it was brought before the House the first thing they experienced was that the Prime Minister treated it as a Party question; it was declared to be a vote of censure; they beat the Party drum and all the appliances were brought to bear to make this a Party question and nothing else. He was as strong a Unionist as anyone in this House and he was a Liberal Unionist a long time before a good many hon. Members who now boasted about being Liberal Unionists. He suffered in his early Unionist days by being turned out of the Eighty Club by his right hon. friend the present Colonial Secretary because he was a Liberal Unionist, but his right hon. friend afterwards saw the error of his ways. He did not yet despair that his right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary might join the Unionist free-traders, and do great service to that cause, as he had done good service to the cause of the Union.

They must keep their eyes open to what was going on throughout the country. His hon. and learned friend did not make one single reference to the controversy which was raging throughout the country, namely, the controversy between free trade on the one side and protection on the other. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and his supporters had been round the country and they had preached purely and simply the doctrine of protection. The supporters of this policy put forward the belief that it would be a very admirable method of improving our industrial position in this country to keep out foreign competition in order that our home manufacturers might get increased prices. That was part of the policy now advocated by means of a vigorous agitation throughout the country. That was operating on the minds of certain interests and classes whose natural object and desire it was—they were men like other men, with more or less selfish interests of their own—to enhance the price of the goods they sold to the consumer. He believed that to be a mistaken policy. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had said that it would be out of order to go into the great question of free trade and protection. To his own mind the interest and object of this debate was to enable His Majesty's Government to say in clear and unmistakable language what it was that they held with reference to the policy which had been put before the country by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. His right hon. friend the Prime Minister had spoken and written often on this subject, but two sentences would make the whole matter clear. An elaborate policy had been put before the country by the late Colonial Secretary, having for its main incidents taxes upon imported manufactures, and taxes upon imported food. Did that scheme and policy recommend itself, or did it not recommend itself, to the mind of the right hon. Gentleman? The House of Commons and the country really had some right to know what was the view held by the leading statesman of this country at the present time on that subject. His hon. and learned friend said they must not deal with the politics of the indefinite future. Why! these were the politics of the moment. These were the questions upon which elections turned. It was no use to say that it was not before the country, because every elector thought it was before the country, and holding that view gave his vote one way or the other. Surely it was time that the House of Commons had a distinct lead on this matter from the right hon. Gentleman. If this debate passed over, as others had done, without any indication as to the view taken by His Majesty's Government as a Government what were they to do? Well, he was a Unionist free-trader. He was happy to say he was not the only Unionist free-trader in the country or the House of Commons, and he knew that Unionist free-traders saw quite clearly what was ahead of them. They were not going to have their Unionism made a stalking horse in order to have that carried out which they believed to be contrary to the interests of the country and the Empire.

He must say a word or two as to the strange attitude of His Majesty's Government with regard to the Liberal Unionist Association. From the beginning he had been a member of that association. He hardly recognised some of his old Liberal Unionist friends tricked out in protectionist garments, which suited them very badly, and made them appear to be very different men from those with whom he was so long associated. The Liberal Unionist Party was being split from top to bottom, as the Liberal Party was over the question of Home Rule. What was meant by the appointment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham as leader of the Liberal Unionist Party in place of the Duke of Devonshire? Every man knew what it meant. It meant that the Liberal Unionist Association and the Liberal Unionists throughout the country were to be rallied as a Liberal Unionist Tariff Reform League, and at the very moment the rupture took place three of His Majesty's Ministers thought it suitable to go down to the Albert Hall and ratify by their presence, approval, and speeches the policy of the Tariff Reform League in calling for the support of the Liberal Unionist Association.

He could not tell, no one could exactly tell, what the main question at the next general election would be, but so far as their short sight could glance into the future, it did appear that there would be no greater question before the country than this fiscal revolution in the sense of departing from our fiscal policy of free imports, whether the goods were manufactured or not, and of imitating the system known in America, Germany, and Continental countries which, he ventured to say, had done those countries no good, and had done nothing toward promoting the welfare of the working classes in Germany or in any other country in Europe. Our own country afforded higher wages than other countries to the working classes of almost every kind, while at the same time in respect of living, which was as important a matter as wages, the articles of ordinary consumption were cheaper here than they were elsewhere. How could any man who knew anything of the subject at all compare the position of the working men in Germany with those of this country? Of course in America the case naturally was different. There was a demand for labour in that country, but he thought he had heard the hon. Member for Battersea in that House draw a graphic description of the sort of life the ironworkers led in that country. The hon. Member thought that even with the working classes of America our own compared very favourably. The matter they had now to deal with was this so-called reform. What they wanted above everything was frankness on the part of His Majesty's Ministers. Let the country understand how these matters stood. He knew the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had an extremely difficult position. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was right to feel the great importance to the country of avoiding a disruption of the Party. He gave him credit for all that. But the rupture had occurred, and he hoped that before the debate closed the right hon. Gentleman would be able to say wherein he differed, if he differed at all, from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. If before the debate ended they had a frank expression of the right hon. Gentleman's policy, then he thought that, although at the eleventh hour of this session, the vote of censure would not have been brought forward in vain.

MR. EMMOTT said the hon. Member who had just sat down in a speech of great ability had brought back the question which they were discussing from the region of fiction to the realm of common sense. As he entirely agreed with the main arguments which the hon. Member had used, he would not waste the time of the House in following his arguments in detail. But he wished to refer to two arguments used by the Colonial Secretary. When he was speaking the right hon. Gentleman asked whether the House considered that it would be right or decent for His Majesty's Ministers, having received so much in the way of preferential treatment from the Colonies, to shut the door on the question of colonial preference. And he said that Lord Rosebery and some of those who had been associated with him had expressed themselves very much in favour of the same system of colonial preference. He did not know why Lord Rosebery had been brought in.

MR. LYTTELTON: I said I thought he has shown leanings towards a system of preference.

MR. EMMOTT: Shown leanings! Lord Rosebery and those who thought with him were as intensely anxious to bind the Colonies to the Empire as the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Gentlemen opposite. Lord Rosebery had shown leanings in the direction of binding together the Colonies and the mother country, but he said words to this effect, "As soon as they began to consider fiscal federation they immediately broke their teeth on the question of the taxation of the food of the people at home."

The complaint of the Opposition was that the Government were playing with this question and were not telling them their real belief. They were trying to make the Colonies think they could devise some scheme of colonial preference; but they did not say frankly whether they were in favour of the taxation of the food of the people, which was said to be a necessary part of colonial preference. To this question the House and the country were entitled to a reply.

Then the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, in excusing the action of the Ministers who had become members of the Liberal Unionist Association, said there was no difference between their action and the action of Lord Salisbury in connection with the National Union of Conservative Associations. He could not conceive how the right hon. Gentleman attempted to prove that to himself. When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham left the Government he deliberately broke up the Liberal Unionist Association in order that he might make it a branch of the Tariff Reform League. He did not think this was doubted. That being the case, two of His Majesty's Ministers immediately joined the association as vice-presidents. Their action differed *toto cœlo* from anything Lord Salisbury ever did in connection with the Conservative Association. Indeed on more than one occasion Lord Salisbury went out of his way to repudiate the doctrine of protection.

He thought too that it was a very unworthy charge for the right hon. Gentleman to make when he said this was a mere Party game. He admitted that Party tactics were necessary and that Party manœuvres were often indulged in. But this was not a mere matter of "outs" and "ins." If it were out of mere curiosity as to the attitude of His Majesty's Government that this Motion had been moved they might with some reason refuse to gratify that curiosity. It was not so much that they, on that side of the House, were wanting this information, as the country. He believed that this prolongation of silence on the part of the Government was of advantage to the Liberal Party; that if they could have no clearer reply from the Prime Minister than from the Colonial Secretary it would be of more advantage to them than to the Ministerial Party. But independent of hon. Members on that side of the House who supported free trade, there were many on his side of the House, for whom he might speak, who put this question as the first political question before the country. They felt that this was a great crisis in the history of the nation, and they were determined to fight all they could on this question, and to make sacrifices as regarded Party in order that the battle might be successfully won. They believed that if this question of free trade was lost and protection was to become the rule of this country, almost everything else they cared about would go. They believed that it would diminish the purity of political life. They believed that sane Imperialism would be a thing of the past. They believed that the old ties of affection with the Colonies would be superseded by a system of bargains, and bargaining with the Colonies meant retaliation in the long run. They believed that the social reform, which they wanted, would go. They believed that there was a great danger of a truculent foreign policy being introduced. And believing all that, they believed that if the free-traders were going to lose this battle, steps would be taken from which the country could never recover, and that, as far as the Liberal programme went, it would be for generations a thing of the past. So, to all of them on that side of the House this was not a mere Party struggle at all. They were fighting for ideas in which they fundamentally believed.

So far he had spoken about his own Party. Let him deal with another class. Let him deal with the ordinary business men of the Conservative turn of mind. He knew numbers of them, men whose families had been Conservatives for generations. They did not care twopence about Cobden or a farthing about theory. They would much rather have followed Mr. Chamberlain and thrown over Cobden if they could have convinced themselves that that was the right thing to do. What happened? The autumn campaign began. They looked forward to it eagerly, anxious to find excuses to follow Mr. Chamberlain, and they saw that intellectually the campaign was a failure. And, examining their own business, they had to come to the conclusion that as far as they were concerned they had to stick to free trade. Where were they now? They had had the first section of the Tariff Reform Committee's Report, which reminded him of the quotation: "*Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus*"

turiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus."

This report again dealt with dumping; we were going to be ruined by dumpers. What were the facts shown in Government publications? The imports of pig-iron from Germany for the first four months of this year were less than half what they were for the first four months of last year. What had happened in the United States? Were all their workers kept employed? Were they going to dump on us ten million tons of iron, as Mr. Chamberlain promised? Nothing of the kind! An enormous number of their furnaces were blown out, and the fear of wholesale dumping from the United States was stopped. Well, then, we were told that we had not got free trade now. If not we had at any rate got a system under which we tried as far as possible to raise taxes for revenue purposes only, and we chose those subjects for taxation which would not, when taxed, give protection to manufacturing interests in this country. If it were argued we had not got free trade, it could be argued just as well that we had not got freedom. For example, the Prime Minister's motor-car, when it went too fast, was interfered with by the police. But at any rate the business man said: "I do not care about your words, but about your things; your plan is a plan which will make matters worse, and I do want to know what the Government really mean."

Take another point. The great manufacturing industries were in suspense, and must be in suspense until this question was settled. They were suffering from the after-effects of the war, and from the ordinary trade wave depression following the boom year 1900. Many wealthy manufacturers often used bad times for extension; but now think what any man would ask himself if he proposed extension. Take the cotton trade. He would look at the Tariff Commission Report on the iron and steel trades, and say, if those things were going to be taxed 5 or 10 per cent., there would probably be a tax on machinery; at any rate, it would cost more to make machinery, whether a tax was put on or not. And not only machinery, but every thing he built a cotton mill with would cost more. Bricks would cost more, because wages would be raised, they were told, to provide for the extra cost of food. The doors and windows would cost more, many of them coming in a half-made condition from abroad. His engines and gearing would cost more. Everything needed for building the mill would cost more. What was the result? He would say to himself, "To-day I can build a mill here in this country so much cheaper than the Germans, that when I have built it I can afford to pay every hand employed in it 10s. a week more and be as well off at the end as the German. I am going to sacrifice that if the principles of this iron and steel trades report are carried out in this country. And more than that, when I come to manufacture in that mill, all the stores I use are going to cost more, even if the cotton does not, the oil, and flour, and leather will all cost more, so my finished product must cost immensely more. Where am I going to get it back. You can put 100 per cent. on my goods, it will not affect me. Out of every £10 worth I make, £2 10s. worth is used at home, the rest goes abroad. What does the foreigner send me? For every £10 worth I send him he only sends me £1 worth. I can tax his £1, and I might make some of those goods, but I cannot recoup myself by any system of Customs duties for the increases in cost that Mr. Chamberlain's scheme would add to the charges that I have to pay." That was the way the quiet business man was dealing with the matter, and he had a right to know what the Government really meant.

It might be said that the Government had put their programme before the country, but had it been put before the country in a way that any reasonable man could fairly understand? There was only one powerful man in the Government, the Prime Minister, and he seemed to believe theoretically in universal free trade; but he repudiated the idea that taxes for revenue purposes were necessarily to be non-protective. He thought we might use a system of retaliation, and that with regard to food it would not be wise to introduce taxes on food at present, though he would be willing to do something in order to bring about federation of the Empire. So the Prime Minister tied himself in this knot. He advocated retaliation, which would only apply to manufactured articles, and not food or raw material. In that case his scheme was unfair to agriculture, he could not retaliate successfully on Russia and the United States of America, and he could only deal with countries like France and Germany, which treated us much better than Russia and the United States did. If the Prime Minister intended to start that system of negotiations, did he intend to have a general tariff or make a special tariff for each country, and in either case how could he prevent it slipping into a regular scheme of protection? The Secretary of State for the Colonies had quoted Carlyle in favour of food taxation, but Carlyle was a most bitter opponent of the corn tax in his own day, and thought anybody a considerable fool if he did not believe that the corn tax would soon be taken off. What Carlyle did say was that the removal of the corn tax would not do all that everybody at that moment imagined it would do, that there were many other questions lying behind that; that, in fact, it was another version of what was said in the Old Book, "man doth not live by bread alone." In saying that he was perfectly right.

Lord Lansdowne seemed to be a retaliator because he wanted some weapon to negotiate with. But what was the remarkable phrase he used in the House of Lords? He said that crossing the fence after the manner the Member for West Birmingham recommended might break every bone in the body of the British Empire. There they had an important Minister, holding an important post, who was still in a state of frank bewilderment as to his opinion on the scheme of the Member for West Birmingham. In this extreme medley of opinions what was an honest politician to think, and what did the plain man think? The plain man knew that the country depended on trade, that trade was the life-blood of the nations, and that the fiscal system of any country depending on trade was the arteries and veins through which its life-blood flowed. He knew that the previous treatment of the country's fiscal arrangements had been right, and now he found his old doctors differing about his condition, some saying he was ill and prescribing new treatment, while others said that the scheme of treatment if carried out might break every bone in the body of the Empire. What did the Prime Minister, the head of the Medical College, say? He said he would tell them at the time of the election, and what he did not tell them then he would tell after the election. What was the use of all this extraordinary mystification? There was only one thing really before the country—whether they were to have protection or free trade. The country would think of nothing else. It would put it thus: "Are we to follow the Member for West Birmingham, or are we to follow those who approve free trade?" The country would make a comparatively simple question of it, and for the sake of the Ministry, and of the portion of the Party which followed it, and for the sake of the country, they ought to make it clear whether they were in favour of colonial preference or not, and whether they intended to tax the food of the country or not.

*MR. CLAUDE LOWTHER (Cumberland, Eskdale) said that the vote of censure was moved chiefly with the object of demonstrating a want of unanimity on the Government Benches. He listened very carefully to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, and he thought that the right hon. Gentleman had conclusively proved that unanimity on the Government Benches existed in a very marked degree. He would ask whether there was similar unanimity on the Benches opposite. Were the Labour Members, for whose ideals he had the utmost respect, going to support the Motion? [Several HON. MEMBERS: Yes.] Then he could only repeat the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition and say "*Que diable faites-vous dans cette galère.*" He had the welfare of the working men at heart; and hon. Members representing Labour would always find him with them in anything they proposed for the benefit of those classes. Were hon. Members representing Labour about to condemn a policy which was vital to the interests of the working classes? It was an incontrovertible fact that our fiscal policy was the only part of our national politics which had never been reviewed by the people. If a *referendum* of the people were taken upon fiscal reform alone, he would not pretend to say what the result would be; but if ever manhood suffrage were introduced—he assumed hon. Members representing Labour would not object to that—the first and immediate result would be the return of a protectionist Parliament. Protection and manhood suffrage were linked together in other countries. That was why he was anxious to see how the Labour Members would vote. They had been entering into strange alliances recently. Who would have thought two years ago that the hon. Member for Battersea, with his modern progressive ideas, would have welcomed the Duke of Devonshire as a partner, it was true only a sleeping partner. He could understand the Motion being supported by many Parties in the House. He could understand it being supported by those gingerbread Imperialists who had no use for the British Empire except in perorations. He could also understand it being supported by that weird assortment of out-of-place young gentlemen and old gentlemen out of place, who, for some unaccountable reason, called themselves free-fooders; but if there was a Party which should not support the Motion, it was the Party representing Labour. Why did they support it? Was it because they objected to protection? Why, the Labour leaders were the greatest protectionists in the country. Protection was the quintessence of trade unionism. How was it that the Labour leaders strenuously supported protection for the British working man against the British capitalist, but opposed protection for the same working man against the foreign capitalist? A free-trade trades unionist was a political anomaly—he demanded free trade for every commodity except his own—his labour; for that he demanded protection. There could be but one outcome—protection for labour at home against labour abroad, or else free trade in labour. He appealed to the Labour Members to reject this Motion. He recognised the power they had, and the influence they exercised over the great mass of trade unionists at elections. But to-day the country was confronted with a question of great complexity, on which, he admitted, there was a great deal to be said on both sides. It was a question which had puzzled the brains of the world's greatest economists; was it, therefore, reasonable to expect working men to be able to understand it, in all its details, in a few months? The working men turned to their leaders for advice and guidance; and on the shoulders of these leaders rested a grave and great responsibility. The time would come when the working men of the country would know the truth; and if their leaders gave wrong advice now, they would be held to account for having sacrificed their vital interests on the altar of political expediency. The British working man was a protectionist at heart, and never lost an opportunity of showing it. He would give an illustration in point. At Alston some Italian workmen who were imported into its mines were attacked and stoned by the Cumberland miners. If these Alston miners blindly followed the advice of the Labour leaders at the next election they would have the astonishing picture of seeing them voting for free imports in the abstract and stoning them in the concrete. The question was—Did Labour leaders in that House advocate the introduction of cheap foreign labour?

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) (satirically): Well—Chinese we do.

Mr. CLAUDE LOWTHER: Did they approve of the introduction of workmen who worked at a lower wage for a longer time? If so, he challenged them to come to Alston, or, indeed, any other industrial centre, and proclaim these views from the platform. He would appeal to those who had the interests of the working man at heart to oppose this Motion and not to take a purely parochial view of a purely Imperial question. He asked them to look at the United States of America, at Australia, and all the highly organised States of Europe. There they found Democracy in possession, Labour paramount, and protection almost universal. Had hon. Members opposite a monopoly of economic knowledge? Both Germany and Canada had tried our present system, and with what results? Labour lock-outs, stagnation, industrial depression. Both countries returned to the policy of protection, and now they saw Canada flourishing and Germany advancing by phenomenal strides. He contended that this vote of censure was a veiled condemnation of the policy adopted in other countries. It could not be denied that it was the commercial and imperial policy of Bismarck that moulded the great German Empire of to-day. But his project of protection was far from unanimously received. Leading political economists were at first against it, but time had proved it the salvation of Germany. Germany's struggle was now our struggle, her crisis our crisis. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had come forward to show that the future of our people lay in a future commercial and Imperial federation. The right hon. Gentleman had said there was no middle path between development and consolidation on the one hand, disruption and decay on the other. Beyond the voices of those who would vote for this Motion of censure he seemed to hear another voice which more correctly expressed the sentiments of the democracy of the Empire—the voice of our Colonies appealing to the democracy of Great Britain to protect the labour of the Empire against the encroachment of the rest of the world.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said that unless the Prime Minister, or whoever spoke on behalf of the Government, indicated that the Government had departed from the Sheffield programme it was his intention, and, he believed the intention, of a large number of other Unionist free-traders, not to take part in the division on the Motion. Such a course demanded a defence from many points of view. His hon. friend who had just sat down regarded the Motion as a declaration of disapproval of protection on the German plan. They should all vote in favour of the Motion if they took that view, and he was sure that many of the Ministers would also be found in the same lobby. But the speech of his hon. friend was very instructive. The hon. Gentleman, he noticed, observed that there was after all some object in the action taken by Lord Lansdowne and others at the Albert Hall. That showed that it was not only free-traders who had a difficulty in comprehending the meaning and intention of the spokesman of the Government. He thought they could not form a just estimate of the conduct of Ministers who had attended the Albert Hall unless they remembered the extraordinary circumstances that had led to that meeting—the reorganisation of the Liberal Unionist Party and the resignation of the Duke of Devonshire. All the analogies of the National Union of Conservatives and of the general duty of Ministers in respect to meetings of that kind were irrelevant unless that point was dealt with, because it was clear that that coloured the whole of the proceedings. It was not his business nor was it his desire to criticise any of the Ministers present personally; but he thought that if they were not in agreement with the right hon Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham—who, of course, was justified in his action by a strong sense of public duty—it would have been more in accordance with ordinary good feeling for those late supporters of the Duke of Devonshire to have postponed till another day their assisting at what was the festival of his deposition. But he did not share the view which had been expressed by many speakers on the Opposition side and said freely in the newspapers that the presence of Ministers at the Albert Hall meeting indicated a change in the policy of the Government. He accepted fully the statement made by Lord Lansdowne on the subject in another place. Lord Lansdowne had said that he adhered to the statement he made at the beginning of the year that the Government was opposed to the imposition of duties on raw material and food supplies; and, further, that their policy, instead of leading to the Birmingham abyss, tended in the opposite direction. As he had said, he accepted that statement. But it was strange that Lord Lansdowne had not explained to the audience at the Albert Hall that, although he regarded their "aspiration"—to use the word of the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary with approval and sympathy, he proposed to follow a policy which led in an opposite direction.

There was a great deal to be said for taking up a moderate position or a middle course. But the Government had not taken a middle course. They had taken an ambiguous course, which was an entirely different thing. One might agree or disagree with a middle course; but that was a thing fundamentally different to an ambiguous course, which some people understood in one sense and some people in another. For instance, there was the question of retaliation. They did not know, and he most keenly desired to know, whether retaliation would be used against one particular country by way of a penal duty against that country, or whether it would be used by way of a tariff wall against all countries, with particular exceptions in favour of countries which came to terms. Then they did not know whether when a retaliatory duty was imposed, and it was found ineffective for retaliatory purposes, it would be retained for protective purposes. His hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Trade said that that was a matter for the Cabinet to answer. Let the House observe how secret the Government kept their policy. It was a matter of Cabinet secrecy, so that even their own subordinates were in doubt as to whether the retaliatory tax would be a permanent equipment of our fiscal system or whether it would be taken off if, and as soon as, it had been tried and failed of its purpose. Then, taking the matter of preference, the Prime Minister said the matter was not ripe; but he had not told them whether he proposed to assist in ripening public opinion or in ripening whatever was unripe in the matter, or to operate in the contrary direction, or to take no part in the process one way or the other. In respect to dumping, there was a good side to dumping as well as a bad, and he did not dispute that on the whole dumping was inimical to the industrial system of the country. But there, again, they were not told what the policy of the Government was, or whether the measures to be taken were to be of a protective character or not. His right hon. friend was in favour of a 10 per cent. duty on manufactured and half-manufactured goods all round, and they had never been told whether the Government were in favour of that or not. Finally, on the particular occasion under discussion, they were told that the sympathy of the Government with the object of his right hon. friend was unabated. What was meant by sympathy? In a certain sense they were all in sympathy with his right hon. friend, they all admired his right hon. friend's devotion to a great Imperial idea, but was that the only sympathy which stirred in the breast of Ministers? Or did they mean by unabated sympathy active co-operation and support? No fair-minded man could deny that the decisions on the points he had named would make all the difference between a truly protectionist system and the system of free imports scarcely modified.

The ambiguity of the Government covered a range of the very widest character. Ambiguity was useful for only two purposes. It was useful for deception and for concealment. He was sure the Government did not intend to deceive anybody; he had not the least doubt they desired to be as truthful as any other persons. But he felt some misgivings whether, with the most honourable intentions, they were not pursuing a policy of concealment in such a way that it was producing the hardship of dislocation and arousing the antagonism which naturally followed upon a system of deception. They all remembered the moral propositions inculcated almost in the nursery that it was possible to start with concealment, never to tell the slightest falsehood, and yet merely by pressure of outside circumstances to get into a position essentially deceptive. He should himself feel some uneasiness if he saw that people understood him in two different senses. He did not refer merely to newspapers, though even when newspapers interpreted him in one sense over a great period of time on a question exciting much public interest it was almost impossible for a public man in a leading position entirely to ignore the circumstance. But not only newspapers, but speakers and writers of signed articles in magazines—everybody understood the Government in different senses. That was producing disastrous consequences. They were told they ought not to shut the door upon colonial preference. What he wanted to do was to shut the door upon protection. He did not believe in colonial preference, and the more he heard the less he believed in it; but his great and principal objection which turned his opposition from a mild criticism into an enthusiastic opposition was that it meant import duties upon food, which were indistinguishable in their results from protection. That being so, he thought they might be told what the Government proposed to do in respect to their supporters' position and their relation with their constituents.

They were told this fiscal controversy was only an academic discussion to educate the public mind, and that was really the attitude of the Government. Free-traders did not object to discussion; they only regretted that they were so seldom allowed to discuss this matter in such a way that they might express their opinions and record their votes without regard to the question of confidence or otherwise in the Government. If they were only sitting round the fireside talking over the fiscal question it was not desirable that some of them should be violently taken by the shoulders and thrown into the passage. Such a proceeding interfered with that calmness of mind with which they would like to listen to his right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham. He observed with very great regret that his right hon. friend the Member for Croydon, in consequence of division of opinion in his constituency on these academic matters, and because he did not feel himself strong enough to go through a bitter contest, was not going to stand again. He should not himself have taken the course his right hon. friend proposed to follow, but how was it possible to make relevant to this sort of discussion phrases about "not shutting the door"? The only person against whom the door was shut was his right hon. friend the Member for Croydon, so far as he could see. How were they to have a fair, open-minded discussion on a great Imperial question if they were not to be secure of their seats in Parliament while that discussion was in progress? What the Government were accused of doing—it was so base that he did not accuse them of it—was of keeping the matter nominally open while they allowed underground efforts to be made to turn their own supporters who did not agree with the new fiscal policy out of Parliament, and then, when that had been done, the machine would go on to carry out the dictates of his right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham. He was quite honest in saying he did not suspect his right hon. friend the Prime Minister of any such intention. He was not quite sure that he did not suspect his right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham. Of course his right hon. friend did not depend on the support of Unionist free-traders. In East Herts he understood that his right hon. friend had an interview with a possible Conservative protectionist candidate, and pressed him to stand against his hon. friend.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN was understood to say that he encouraged him.

Lord HUGH CECIL submitted that such action was not calculated to create an atmosphere suitable for the discussion of this "academic" question with an open mind. Was it not manifest that while they were talking about discussion his right hon. friend was up and doing? The issue was now joined. Were the Government going to give no guidance as to what their decision was to be? See how they would be placed assuming their attitude was one of sympathy with his right hon. friend, but of disagreement on certain points. Suppose the free-traders won, evidently the Government would be left sympathising with his right hon. friend. If his right hon. friend won, they would be left disagreeing from his right hon. friend, but in either case their sympathy and disagreement would be of no importance because it would not have been effective in the time when the work was to be done. What was wanted was not a decision abstractly just in some future period but a decision on the present state of things. If the Government were against preference now they ought to say so. They might keep an open door for themselves and say that circumstances in the future might make judicious what was now injudicious, but that at present they disapproved of it and would give it no support: that would be a consistent and straightforward course, and if it was a true expression of their view he could not conceive why they should not take it. Therefore he was driven to the conclusion that they wished to help his right hon. friend, but would not publicly say so.

He submitted that the Ministers who attended the Albert Hall had been guilty of what in the old sense of the word was a scandalous proceeding. He thought it gave an occasion of stumbling and was intended to mislead opinion. It created what was strictly and properly a scandal in the Unionist Party. The hon. Member for Norwich, in an interesting letter to *The Times*, suggested, as did also a phrase in the circular issued in the usual course from the Treasury Whips, that Ministers were entitled to every support because of the danger to the country from foreign complications. The hon. Member was entitled to use that argument, and he did not at all deny that it was a consideration which ought to be present to all of them on this occasion. But the Government were not entitled to use that argument. What were they to think of the Foreign Secretary who, knowing as he must know, that foreign affairs were in a complicated and dangerous condition, went to a meeting and took a course which he must have known would be most gratuitously offensive to a large section of his supporters; and then afterwards told them—Oh, the situation is so dangerous you must not censure what we have done? What was that but an open, unconcealed confession of a gross indiscretion? It was nothing but saying that what these Ministers did was to jeopardise national interests. If it did not mean that it meant nothing. Then the final defence was that Lord Lansdowne would exert a restraining influence over his right hon. friend. "Canst thou draw out leviathan with an hook? or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down? Will he make a covenant with thee? Wilt thou take him for a servant for ever?"

He disagreed with the action of these Ministers, and he disapproved it; and in these circumstances he might be asked, "Why not support the Opposition in the Division Lobby?" He drew a distinction between this and the earlier divisions. This Motion did not directly raise the issue of free trade and protection; it raised only the indiscretion of Ministers on a particular occasion. But the main reason which determined him was that he thought they ought to put aside from their minds all considerations of irritation, and decide what was best in the interests of free trade, best in the public interests generally, and best in the interest of the many objects that the Unionist Party had in view. The general policy of the country appeared to him, as a Unionist, better consulted by the continuance of the present Government in power than by the substitution of the Opposition. That was such an obvious consideration that he need not dwell upon it. He thought that Ministers were a much more competent Government than any Government likely to take their place. Was this, then, in the interest of free trade, and that was the supreme question with him? He thought that it was. He believed it to be supremely in the interest of free trade that they should not widen the gap between free-trade Unionists and the rest of the Party except when principle absolutely required it. A great many persons on both sides of the House said that his hopes were vain and delusive. They thought that the Party was absolutely committed to protection, and that it was only a question of time when the position of free-trade Unionists would become impossible, and that these hon. Gentlemen might as well recognise the facts now. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham thought that he possessed the majority of the Unionist Party and that the minority ought to give way to the majority. The right hon. Gentleman might or might not possess the majority now. It would not make any difference to him which way the majority thought, because he believed that there was no more ignominious form of idolatry than the worship of a majority. Whatever be the case now, he confessed that within the last few months he had felt a growing hope that ultimately the Unionist Party would return to free trade.

He was aware that the Unionist Party was an Imperialist Party, but he was convinced that the right hon. Gentleman's policy, from an Imperial point of view, apart from its economics, was a mistake. He believed that it started with the same mistake as the Manchester school made, namely, that it grotesquely exaggerated the importance of trade as a unifying principle. This unifying doctrine was one of the most difficult things to justify by any appeal to history. The English traded much more with the Germans than they did with the Italians, and yet they did not entertain warmer feelings for the Germans than were entertained for the Italians. It might be useful as a unifying element where, in the case of a great volume of trade, the destruction of it meant a grave commercial crisis, but it operated only to stop actual disruption. The establishment of a Zollverein would be a small matter politically considered; nor again, on the other hand, would a reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States be the colossal danger which the right hon. Gentleman believed it to be. Canada would be just as loyal to us after such a treaty as it was now. Secondly, he thought that it was unproved that a Zollverein, in its general effect, had a unifying influence apart from the degree in which it encouraged trade. The House was always pointed back to the example of Germany. Had those who quoted the illustration of the German Zollverein ever reflected on this single circumstance? Thirty-one years after it was instituted Austria and Prussia were at war, and the Prussian kingdom annexed several other kingdoms which were members of the Zollverein. The hon. Gentleman thought that the right hon. Member for Birmingham was going to unite the British Empire in the same way as Bismarck united the German Empire. He sincerely hoped not. Any one who had read German history must be aware that the source of German unity was the military power of France and the military power of Prussia, which drove the smaller States into union. The Zollverein was a subordinate matter. He believed a Zollverein to be impossible in the British Empire for this reason—that the Colonies were at present protectionist. They would never admit our goods perfectly free unless they became free-traders. If they were prepared to throw down their tariff barriers and admit our goods free, it was clear that they would first of all have abandoned the whole protectionist theory of the protection of commerce.

But whatever might be said about a Zollverein, preference was not a Zollverein. It was not like it, and he did not think that it would lead to a Zollverein. It was not a simple system of throwing down Customs tariffs within a certain limit; it was a capricious choosing of industries here and there for a special advantage. We were to pay more for everything, more, certainly, for corn for the benefit of the corn producer, while exporting more freely to Canada what we manufactured. A more capricious system, tainted with essential unfairness from top to bottom, he did not think could be devised; and he could not believe that it would have a unifying effect. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that it was for a great period of time the policy of this country. There was a differential duty in favour of Canadian timber as late as 1860. Timber was one of the great Canadian productions, but no one could suggest that Canada was more loyal or more attached to the Empire before 1860 than she had become since.

What, then, became of the unifying tendency of preference? We ought to turn our minds towards Imperial unity away from trade in another direction. If we were to use the illustration of German unity as a model, it should be a Kriegsverein, and not a Zollverein. Something of the kind was revealed by the war in South Africa, where we had a military union. It could not be a very difficult thing to carry out what had been done temporarily by a more elaborate and worked-out system. He respected the Government for having admitted to the Council of Defence a Canadian member. That had an ease and a simplicity about it which contrasted very happily indeed with the fiscal policy. It was a national step, taken when the time was ripe for it; it was not a policy thrust down the throat of the United Kingdom by agitation, meetings, excitement, Party splits, and electioneering devices. He would like to see the Colonies taken into much closer confidence in all diplomatic negotiations. so that they might know not only what it was possible to see publicly, but what was known privately as to the genesis of any great war. The Imperial service should be much more widely thrown open to the Colonies. It was in that direction, and not in the direction of trade, we ought to look for Imperial unity. Therefore, he did not think that the Conservative Party, because it was an Imperialist Party, was necesarily a protectionist Party. It was possible to dissever Imperialism from protectionism, and it would be better for Imperialism when this was done.

The right hon. Gentleman would find, he was sure, that the Conservative Party was a bad instrument for revolution. It was a defensive and not an aggresive Party; and to use it for the purposes of revolution would be like trying to run a man through with a breastplate. Sooner or later he felt persuaded that the Unionist Party would return to its proper function of defending the great institutions that were threatened, the great interests that were threatened, against the most unwise attacks being made and that would be made. It would return to its proper enterprise and its proper tasks. Not to mention minor questions, there was the great growth of the labour movement, which would necessitate a readjustment of the relations between labour and capital. When that time came many of his hon. friends who thought badly of political economy now would take a different view of that science hereafter. They would not call it a collection of shibboleths when they were dealing with a proposal to fix wages by law, and possibly they would look with a brighter eye than now upon the despised school of *laissez-faire*. Personally he would hold the same opinion as he did now. He would be the opponent of labour movements such as he had indicated, and he was the opponent of the protectionist movement. Each had something in common, and the fact that it was so did not increase his confidence in the one or the other. He and his hon. friends would abstain from this division with their eyes fixed on the future, regretting the present divisions in the Party and looking forward to a day of union. In the contests yet to be fought it would be no light advantage to the Conservative Party that those contests should be fought while the necessaries of life were still cheap, and that the arguments of questions between capital and labour should not be confusedly any distress caused by the cost of living. After much obloquy and pain, and after having, perhaps, been excluded from Parliament by the arts of hon. Gentlemen, he felt confident that nevertheless, by reason of their good cause and their faith in it, the ultimate victory would rest with him and his hon. friends.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: During the early part of this debate I thought it would be quite unnecessary for me to take any part in it, and that I might preserve a wholly detached attitude, because the object of the Leader of the Opposition was to show that His Majesty's Government was in entire agreement with me; and it was not to my interest to prove the contrary. If the right hon. Gentleman could convince me of that by evidence that I have not been able to discover, I could only be grateful to him. I should not have taken part in the debate, therefore, but for the very eloquent, moderate, and most good-humoured speech to which we have just listened, and the appeal which the noble Lord made to me in regard to a practical aspect of this question. My noble friend desires to see reunion in the Unionist Party, and he complains that his position and that of his friends is made difficult by the intervention of myself and my friends in the constituencies. Well, Sir, he put it to me that I had advised a certain gentleman to stand for a constituency now occupied by a Unionist Member. I do not think I need go into the details of a conversation which I thought entirely idle at the time; but I admit that I did advise and even encourage what I thought to be the gentlemanly, laudable intention. But if that was wrong on my part what is to be said of those who issue manifestoes praying all Unionist electors to withdraw the support from any Unionist Member who goes further than my noble friend in regard to fiscal reform? What is to be said of the Free Food League, of which I believe my noble friend is a distinguished member, which goes down to Birmingham and opens an office there with the express object of defeating, if possible, the present Member for South Birmingham who stood as a Unionist candidate?

LORD HUGH CECIL: The Free Food League has never taken such action as a body.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not care a brass button whether it acts as a body or as a part of a body. I know they went to oppose the Unionist candidate, though the eloquence seems to have had very little effect. I think my noble friend himself went to Birmingham to address a meeting.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Yes, but not during an election.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: But what was the noble Lord's object? He is not accustomed to waste his eloquence on the desert air; and if he went there and made a hot attack on me and my policy, surely the only conclusion is that he desired to produce on the minds of the constituents of myself and my colleagues the impression that they would be wiser not to return us again. All I wish to say to my noble friend is that it does not lie with him to throw stones. But do not let him suppose for a moment that I object to the course which he took on that occasion or to a similar course on the part of his friends. In his eloquent peroration the noble Lord must have convinced the House of the sincerity with which he holds his views. Will he not believe that those who differ from him hold with equal sincerity and earnestness their belief that the future of this country and of the Empire depend upon the adoption at no distant date of the policy which we advocate and at which we are aiming? So long as that is the case on both sides, I hope without any unfriendliness, we must carry our policies to their legitimate issues.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I said that the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman took up made the position of the Government a very unreasonable one.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: There is one thing I might add to what I have said. As far as I know, no association with which I have been connected has ever instigated opposition to any other Member on our side of the House. Perhaps instigated is not the word, and I should say has never initiated opposition. What we have said is that this is a matter for the constituencies, and of course for the Parties in each constituency. On the same evening that the Liberal Unionist Council passed the resolution to which reference has been made, another resolution was passed declaring that the whole support of the association should be given to any Liberal Unionist candidate who was duly selected by his committee to support the Government, without reference to his views on fiscal reform. To that resolution I most cordially subscribe; but if a Liberal Unionist constituency, through its representative association, declares that it is wholly at variance with the sitting Member, and will not select him again, and desires that another candidate should be selected, then I say undoubtedly that we are quite prepared to give our support to the candidate so selected, and we shall not complain in the slightest degree if the same measure is meted out to us which we have meted out to others.

But the debate seems to have wandered from its original object, which was really a very narrow one. It was the desire of the Leader of the Opposition to identify the Prime Minister with my views on the subject of preference; and I understood him to suggest by that rather curious quotation from Dr. Arnold which he introduced, I thought rather irrelevantly, that it was his desire, if he could convict my right hon. friend of any special sympathy with me, at once to take him out and hang him. It is not for me to speak for my right hon. friend. Neither, perhaps, is it for me to accept a statement of his opinions which I do not believe to be accurate. If there is no difference between my right hon. friend and myself, why did I leave the Government? There was absolutely no necessity for my leaving the Government except this—that I held with sincerity the views which I have subsequently placed before the country. I recognised that my right hon. friend did not go as far as I wished to go, and that my continued presence in the Government would mean either that I should embarrass him or that I myself should be unable to speak freely. Therefore, I went to speak freely to the country on a matter to which I attached so much importance.

I hear statements about the ambiguity of the Government's position. If my noble friend means to say that he does not know at the present time the whole mind of my right hon. friend on a subject not before Parliament, very likely he is right. But what right has he to inquire? On what principle has any Member of this House the right to criticise His Majesty's Government as to what may or may not be their policy or that of their successors years hence? Again and again I have heard Liberal and Conservative Governments absolutely refuse to give any information as to their policy for the next session of Parliament. How much less are they bound to say what their schemes and policies will be not in a future session but in a future Parliament? What my right hon. friend has said is this. When the Colonial Secretary repeated it to-night there went up a shout from those Benches as if it were something perfectly new. What my right hon. friend said from the moment I left his Government was that he sympathised with the great aspirations which I have put before the country; that he sympathised with the idea of preferential terms between the Colonies and ourselves, even though those terms may involve a slight addition to our duties on food. Have hon. Gentlemen heard that for the first time? Have they not read the letter which my right hon. friend addressed to me when I resigned? They will find it all there, as well as in the Sheffield speech and the Bristol speech. And now they have discovered this declaration apparently this afternoon, are they no longer going to say that there is any ambiguity about the position of my right hon. friend? He assured me of his sympathy, but at the same time he said that, in his opinion the policy was not at the present time a practicable one, or one likely to be accepted by the people of this country. There probably is the difference which existed then, and which I fear still exists, between my right hon. friend and myself. I myself think that this policy is ripe, at any rate, to be submitted to the people of this country. I do not say that the people of this country would accept it at the first offer. I have never pretended—I have been perfectly frank with the country and with my supporters—I have never pretended that a great change of this kind could be expected to be hastily accepted by a people who for sixty years had been going on under a totally different system. But that it will be accepted I am as certain as that I am standing here. As the consummation which I desire will come all the sooner the sooner the proposal is made to the country, for that reason, so far as I am concerned, the sooner the election comes the better I shall be pleased. Of course, if my late colleagues had accepted that view, which perhaps is a wrong one, there would have been no occasion for me to leave the Government, but as they did not accept it they are perfectly right in saying that they do not propose that policy to the present Parliament, and in saying that as to what they or any one else will propose to another Parliament is a thing which it will be quite time enough to discuss when that times come. In my own opinion, at any rate, that is perfectly consistent, logical, and defensible, and there is not the slightest ambiguity about it. My right hon. friend, as I have said, sympathises with my policy of preference, but the noble Lord almost went as far as that. This at least I may say of him, that he sympathises with the ideal which I have in view.

Lord HUGH CECIL: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: He sympathises with my object; it is merely as to methods or manner that he differs from me. Well, he has stated that in his opinion an arrangement such as I propose would not be a unifying arrangement, that it would be a capricious arrangement, and that the object should be sought by other means. A capricious arrangement! Then every treaty with every foreign nation for any commercial arrangement whatsoever must be barred. I suppose the noble Lord, if he had been living at the time of Mr. Cobden, would have repudiated that great man when he made the French treaty. What was the French treaty? Was it not an arrangement in which particular articles were picked out here and there and reciprocal concessions made? It was just as capricious as anything, and even more capricious than anything, that I have proposed. And if it is legitimate to make a reciprocal arrangement with a foreign country, why in Heaven's name should it not be proper to make an arrangement with your own kinsmen? Why are they the only people with whom you refuse to treat or make a two-sided bargain? My noble friend said it was not a unifying arrangement. He differs in that respect from all those who ought to know. Who is it that wants this arrangement? The Colonies. Does anybody doubt that? [Hon. Members: Yes.] What proof would satisfy hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Colonies do desire such an arrangement as I propose Take Canada, I should have thought we had the most absolute proof that could be given, short indeed of an actual treaty. You have had statements of the Prime Minister of Canada, when, with the other Prime Ministers, he unanimously proposed to this country that they should undertake negotiations for the purpose of making such a preferential arrangement. You had the Budget speeches of Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance. I myself quoted some time ago a letter which I received from him in which he said that all Parties in Canada were in favour of preferential arrangements. Although there might be difficulties, he for one did not believe that British and colonial statesmen, coming together, would not be able entirely to overcome them. Do you think that these gentlemen are not entitled to speak for their people? Will you take the boards of trade? They are precisely those representative associations where you would expect most opposition, because they generally represent the manufacturers. Yet there is not an important board of trade in Canada which has not passed a strong resolution in favour of preference. Are you doubtful about Australia? Will you accept the views of three successive Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth—Sir Edward Barton, Mr. Deakin, and Mr. Watson? Can you not see in all these declarations proof of what I assert—that they are favourable to such an arrangement, and that they desire that we should propose it? That, my noble friend says, will not be a unifying arrangement. To do something which the Colonies unanimously ask you to do will be to drive them away. To refuse to do what they ask and offer them something which they will not accept—that, forsooth, is the way to unite the Empire. I do not agree with my noble friend.

Now, I venture very seriously, not to put a Question, because Questions in this House are not answered if they are awkward to answer. The Opposition have shown themselves quite as clever in evading them as ever we have been able to do. But I put this question for consideration before the Opposition. You condemn the Government, not because they are doing anything, not because they are proposing anything, but because you suspect, or suspect, at all events, some members of them, of sympathy—of what you called concealed sympathy, although I think it is open sympathy—with this idea of preference. You can only do that by yourselves frankly and definitely declaring that you have no sympathy with it, and will not look at it under any conditions. Now, is that your position? Is it your position as responsible people who may very shortly be occupying office yourselves, is it your position that, no matter what the Colonies say to you, no matter what offer they may make to you, no matter what advantages or concessions they will offer you, that you will shut the door in their faces and tell them, "No. We are opposed to preference? We wanted to hang one Prime Minister because we suspected him of it; and, of course, we should, ourselves, be ready to commit harri-karri if we had sympathy with it." Though I put the Question I do not press for an Answer, because I should be sorry to have it as positively given as I think it must logically be. But if you say, on the other hand, "No. We are prepared to meet an offer from the Colonies if it is good enough," then I should ask you another question—Will you agree to call the Colonies to your councils? I have been satisfied loyally to accept and support the position taken up by the Government in this matter. So far as their policy of retaliation goes, I entirely approve of it in principle. As to the details, I am content to wait till I see them. But I admit that, to my mind, the policy of preference is more urgent and important than the policy of retaliation. The policy of retaliation might, I think, be adopted at a much later stage, although, perhaps with less chance of advantage than at present. But the opportunity for the policy of preference is sliding away. If it be not accepted within a reasonable time, the offer will no longer remain open. I go, therefore, one step further than I have ever gone before in connection with anything that this Government may do, and I urge my right hon. friend the Prime Minister especially to consider whether, in view of the importance of this question, of the primary importance of knowing what it is that the Colonies really wish, and what is is that they are prepared to do, he should not ask them both questions, and should not call a conference from the Colonies, a conference of representatives to meet and consider this subject, in order that the House and the country may discover whether, in what I have said on this subject, I have based myself upon real knowledge and experience, or whether those are right who from the first, almost before they knew what my policy could be, determined to oppose it on purely Party grounds.

*Mr. BELL (Derby) said when the Prime Minister was good enough to give the opportunity to discuss the question of free trade and protection before the country he should be prepared to take an active part in the discussion. The present issue before the House, as he understood it, was the neglect of the Government in not calling upon some of its members to give an account of themselves in associating themselves with an organisation, the ostensible object of which was to propagate the principles of protection throughout the country. He viewed this subject on lines on which he, among others, had been condemned at law for a great principle. The Government was the Executive of the Party in power, a great organisation, and the Prime Minister as the head was responsible for the action of his subordinates. Three years ago the decision of another House in the case of the trades unions was that those at the head of a union who associated themselves with the acts or action of the subordinate members or officials of the union who caused any injury to others, were to be held responsible. The union argued that this was not law, but was told in reply that it was common law based on common sense. If that was binding on a body of organised workers it was binding on any other organised body. The reason of that decision was stated by the Attorney-General in the debate that took place upon it, to be the fact that the heads of the union had not taken the steps of calling upon the subordinate officials to resign, and he (Mr. Bell) maintained that, inasmuch as some of the subordinate colleagues of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had associated themselves with an organisation outside the Government which, in his opinion, was inflicting great injury on our trade and commerce at the present time, they ought to be called upon by the right hon. Gentleman to relinquish their positions in the Government or that the Government should be held responsible.

He admired the candour and straightforward manner in which the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had put before the House and country the policy in which he believed. Whether they agreed with it or not they knew from him definitely what he proposed to do, and those who did not agree could only fight him on that policy. The hon. Member for Eskdale called himself the friend of the working man, and they had a large number of friends of the same kind who were prepared to support legislation for the benefit of the working man, so far as they could understand them. The difficulty was to get them to appreciate, in the same way as the Labour Members, those things which were good for the workers. The Labour Members surely should know something of what was beneficial to the working man; of his surroundings, and the necessity there was for greater comfort and happiness. But the answer to the hon. Member for Eskdale had been given by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, who stated that the Conservative Party was a defensive and not an aggresive Party. And they had certainly defended themselves against anything which had been brought forward to benefit the working man. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham now based his policy on the great desire for unity between this country and the Colonies, but the original reason given by him for the tax on corn was that the revenue received should provide old-age pensions. Nothing was now said as to that. The right hon. Member had jumped from stage to stage, and his third plea was that it would save the ruined industries of this country. The right hon. Gentleman had now got beyond that to the unity of this country with the Colonies. He was as anxious for that as the right hon. Gentleman, but the means he would adopt to bring about that end would not be identical with those advocated by the right hon. Gentleman. It was for that reason that he supported this Motion. He was anxious that the Prime Minister should let the House and the country know what was in his mind. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister could not defend the action of members of his Cabinet propagating principles in the country at a time when he himself entertained something quite different. The country did not know what it was to look forward to. They wanted to know what the Government policy was. So far every by-election had been fought on the question of protection versus free trade. If that was not the policy of the Government it was in the interest of the Government that they should declare that fact to the House so that the House might know what was the interest in this question. He and his colleagues in the House would fight this question for all they were worth; they would take part in every election where the issue was free trade or protection. He and all the Labour Members in the House would support this Motion, which they trusted would be carried.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

VOTE OF CENSURE—MINISTERS OF THE CROWN (PREFERENTIAL DUTIES).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question (1st August), "That this House regrets that certain of His Majesty's Ministers have accepted official positions in a political organisation which has formally declared its adhesion to a policy of Preferential Duties involving the taxation of food."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed.

MR. PURVIS (Peterborough) said the arguments in support of the Motion had been confined to the question of the taxation not of food in general but of bread in particular. It was true that the fiscal policy of the Liberal Unionist Council included a tax upon corn, but only in order that the amount obtained should be returned to the people in remission of taxation on other kinds of food. They allowed that their policy involved the taxation of corn, but they disclaimed the charge made in this Motion. The right hon. Gentleman who moved the Motion asked the Prime Minister how he reconciled the policy of Sheffield with that of Birmingham, but the Government and the Liberal Unionist Council and the Unionist Party were no more in favour of the taxation of every kind of food than the right hon. Gentleman himself. It might not be wrong to tax corn in particular because it was wrong to tax all food. All this arose owing to the opinion held by hon. Gentlemen opposite that we were going back to the days of the old Corn Laws, but the days of the old Corn Laws, with their sliding scale and all their shackles, were gone for ever. The aim of the fiscal reformers was not protection at all, they were as much free-traders as hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. What they sought was a step towards universal free trade, but that was as far off at present as universal peace. They were endeavouring to obtain free trade within the Empire. They had it in the United States of America. The war between North and South was not a war fought primarily on the question of slavery but for State rights. The North wished to abolish State rights, the South to retain them, and Lincoln declared over and over again that if the Confederated States agreed to give up State rights, so as to make free trade within the United States of America possible, he would agree with them though slavery were not abolished. They fought the matter out, with the result that free trade within the Empire was secured and was now enjoyed by 80,000,000 of the human race. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham sought to secure the same result by peaceful means, for the benefit of one-fourth of the civilised world. This matter lay with this country and this country alone; the Colonies were ready and willing to join hands with us. Turn away from them and the Empire would be like a tree shorn of its foliage in summer, its life gone; but this surely would not be allowed to be. We recognised the wishes of our Colonies and agreed with them, and those wishes would realise themselves and this problem would be solved.

*SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham) said it had been stated that the Unionists did not propose to tax all food, but only certain kinds. It was because they proposed to tax that kind which was most used by the people that they met with so much resistance from the country. It was also said that free trade within the Empire was a very desirable object if it could be attained. So he said, but no one would be more emphatic than the right hon. Member for West Birmingham in admitting that free trade within the Empire was utterly unattainable, because our self-governing Colonies were dependent upon their tariffs for their revenue, therefore it would be useless to ask them to sweep them away. The right hon. Gentleman quoted various colonies as being entirely favourable to his proposal, and he laid great stress upon the opinion of Canada. He did not pretend to set his opinion against the right hon. Gentleman's, but his experience at the congress of the chambers of commerce held in Montreal last year showed that although there was a large volume of opinion in favour of colonial preference it was on the distinct understanding that the preference should not inflict harm upon the industries of the mother country or other parts of the Empire. Canada recognised that if such an arrangement would inflict injury upon the mother country it would be only less disastrous than injury done to herself. While it would be easy for some of the Colonies who at present had a tariff wall round them to make a preference arrangement, it would be altogether a different matter for the mother country, who had no such tariff walls in existence. Not only Canada but our Colonies generally greatly valued their fiscal freedom. A system of Imperial preference would limit that freedom. The advantage of this freedom was shown in the case of Canada recently, when the preference of 33 1/3 per cent. on woollen goods from this country was reduced to 15 per cent., because the larger preference had the effect of closing certain woollen mills in Canada, and at the same time the preferences in respect of other articles were reduced from 33 1/3 to 20 per cent. Canada was undoubtedly acting within her rights in that matter. The right hon. Gentleman had said the impulse towards preference had come from the Colonies, and yet when the right hon. Gentleman was invited to visit Australia it was represented to him by Mr. Deakin that his visit would give an immense impetus to the preferential movement out there. That seemed to indicate that the movement was hanging fire in the Commonwealth, and that was not surprising in view of the fact that the chief export from Australia was wool, which would not be likely to get any advantage from the Birmingham proposals.

He held that the system of preferential tariffs would involve us in great risks, whereas we should stand to gain very little in return. The system was by no means new. We gave a preference to colonial sugar from 1660 to 1854, to colonial corn from 1766 to 1849, to colonial wool from 1721 to 1860, and to colonial coffee from 180(to 1851. They were dropped because they were found to do more harm than good. Very adequate reasons must therefore be shown before this country gave its consent to revive that old discredited policy. He did not reflect upon the wisdom of other nations when he held that free trade was the best system for this country. Under that system our industries had been built up, and he would never listen to any suggestions to discard it unless after full and careful inquiry, not with closed doors, but in a perfectly open way by an impartial Commission under Government sanction, who would receive evidence from men holding various fiscal views. Our industries had adapted themselves to existing fiscal conditions. Some industries had developed abnormally, but that fact only increased the danger of tampering with the system. The case of Germany could not be quoted in support of colonial preference, because that country had not adopted anything of the kind. Great Britain had as free access into German colonies as Germany herself. The hon. Member for Stretford had drawn an attractive picture of a system which would draw taxes out of the pockets of the taxpayers without their knowing it, but he could not help thinking of the advice that if one found oneself in company with a person who could extract money from people's pockets without their knowledge, the best thing to do was to get as far away from him as possible. Retaliation often did more harm to the country which retaliated than to the country which was retaliated upon. Retaliation also frequently led to tariff wars, which had proved highly injurious to the countries resorting to them. Take the case of the Franco-Swiss tariff war of 1893–5. What was its effect? Swiss imports from France fell off 42 per cent. Swiss exports to France fell off 37 per cent. And in the result third parties alone were the gainers, whilst Franco-Swiss trade had never since regained its former dimensions.

While he should be willing to deal with each case on its merits, before he supported a policy of retaliation he would have to be assured that it gave promise of success that he should hit his opponent much harder than he would be hit himself, and that Parliamentary sanction had been obtained in each particular case. Those safeguards would be necessary to prevent abuse of the system. He believed this vote of censure was justified because of the want of candour which had characterised the attitude of the Government with regard to the subject. He thought the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham that the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had expressed his sympathy with colonial preference even if it should involve a slight taxation of food would perplex the country more than ever, because he did not see how such a statement could be reconciled with the declaration of Lord Lansdowne that the Government were opposed to preferential arrangements with the Colonies which involved the taxation of food. If Lord Lansdowne had said as much as that at the Albert Hall there would have been ructions, and he might have been invited to resign the vice-presidency to which he had just been elected. They complained not so much of Lord Lansdowne's speeches, although they seemed to vary with his surroundings, as of his conduct in joining an association which had undergone reorganisation and was pledged to support the whole policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. It was unfair that Lord Lansdowne should have been persuaded to accept this high position, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham must be laughing in his sleeve at the way he was capturing one Minister after another.

The right hon. Gentleman spoke of colonial preference being a more urgent question than any other. Surely that statement ought to have made Lord Lansdowne very careful before accepting the position of vice-president. Should Lord Lansdowne desire to contest that view with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, it seemed to him that he would now be entirely muzzled, for the chairman at that meeting said that it was the essence of the Party system that the minority should not use their power to hinder the work which the majority had decided upon. The Colonial Secretary that afternoon laid stress upon the alleged sympathy of the Prime Minister with the Birmingham fiscal proposals. He thought the Prime Minister had receded from the favourable view he held in this respect some time ago; for, speaking in Manchester on 12th January, 1904, he used these words—

> "I have expressed the opinion both in 1902 and last year that a closer union with the Colonies must be looked for in the direction of fiscal union. Well, I have somewhat changed that opinion."

They all agreed that the idea of consolidating the Empire was a fine inspiration, but unless Ministers were very careful the result would be more one of disruption than consolidation. In the report of the interview with the Colonial Premiers in 1902 it was stated that the circumstances of the different Colonies differed so widely that it was apparent that no arrangement applicable to all the Colonies could be devised. He thought a more hopeful way would be by the federation of the Colonies with the mother country in some Imperial Council, and in that way they would give effect to the wise words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he said, "Call us into your counsels."

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that this debate was one which involved the commercial and industrial welfare, not only of this country, but also of the Colonies. The last speaker had said that tariff walls necessarily meant tariff wars, but that statement had been entirely disproved by experience. Where retaliation had been projected by one country against another a tariff war might have ensued, but it had not in the case where a majority of the commercial exploiting countries had adopted a protective policy. For instance, between Germany and the United States, or between France and the United States, there had not been tariff wars inimical to either or both of those countries. The proposition that they must not try an experiment in protective policy or retaliation, because they would endanger a tariff war, had not been proved by the evidence of the past. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich said that trade did not unify, and he instanced Germany as an example of federation secured by the sword. But whilst that was so, he would remind the noble Lord that in that case after conquest the States concerned combined for the purposes of a common commercial enterprise and a common exploitation of their general interests. They were used to hearing the statement that the United States was a combination of States with very different interests, but he thought the British Empire had more differing interests than the United States. Within the combination of the United States they had many nationalities, including Frenchmen, Spaniards, and native-born Americans, all combining first by conquest, and then by a common commercial purpose, for the general national benefit and interest.

Sir William Holland.

His noble friend the Member for Greenwich threw some doubt upon the possibility of our achieving any benefit from a combination with the Colonies—he meant in the sense of exchange carefully arranged. He had in his pocket a letter from one of the most prominent colonial statesmen in the Empire, and in that letter he said that if the British people granted the Colonies what they were asking for it would not be a sacrifice but rather a preference for a preference; the battle would be sooner over, and the British elector would come to the conclusion that no sacrifice would be required, but rather that there would be a general gain by an adjustment of interests with consideration for all local requirements. That might be a difficult matter, but he did not admit that it was impossible. He had heard again and again the statement made that they would invite irritation and opposition, and produce a danger to the very consolidation of the Empire if they attempted to arrange commercial treaties. Was it not the case that the true federations which now existed within the Empire were achieved upon the basis of compromise? In Canada they had complicated tariffs at the time of the federation. It was then asserted that if they attempted federation they would be faced by the perils of a tariff war, and that they would experience those very anxieties which had been prophesied if they attempted federation now. What had been the result? The seven colonies of the Dominion had combined for the common purpose of national development. In Australia they had six colonies combining, one of which had steadfastly stood out for free trade from the beginning, and they had sacrificed the immediate and local interests to the common and national good. It was said that in this case distance was a factor which would naturally prevent a harmonious combination. He thought they could devise a scheme of preference which would work to the common good. With the advantage they had of quick transportation nowadays there was constant communication with the Colonies, and Quebec was no further from London in this sense than Liverpool was from London forty years ago. Therefore the argument of distance fell to the ground. The argument of differing tariffs also fell to the ground, because what might be achieved by a small organisation might also be achieved in a larger one such as was represented by the Colonies of this Empire.

The Leader of the Opposition said that they could not make a bargain with Australia because in order to carry it out they would have to put a tax upon raw material. A tariff in favour of wool would not benefit the Australian, because wool did not need stimulation, and the limit of wool production had been practically reached. It was, however, quite different with corn. Australia desired a tax upon foreign wool, foreign meat, foreign wine, and foreign corn, because at the present time there were twice the number of people employed in agricultural wine-growing pursuits in Australia than were employed in pastoral occupations. The hon. and learned Member for South Shields had informed the House, apparently without any knowledge of the exact conditions which prevailed, that this policy of preference was projected by the free-trade Party in the Colonies. That statement was wholly and absolutely incorrect. A Resolution in favour of preference was passed by the Canadian Parliament in 1892, and at that time the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol expressed a feeling in favour of a commercial Zollverein with the Colonies. There had been no question of Party in the Colonies in regard to this policy of preference. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham was, he believed, expressing the opinion of 90 per cent. of the people who lived in the Colonies when he said that they desired a closer commercial union with the mother country. This request of the Colonies for a closer commercial union was not a question of sudden growth. After twenty years of residence in the Colonies he expressed the conviction that this country need not fear the possibility of irritation, quarrelling, and conflict with the Colonies if such a commercial arrangement was made. Abraham Lincoln once said that "it is easier to make bargains with your own kin than to make treaties with foreign countries."

He ventured to say that there was very little faith in a man who would not at least give an opportunity for a fair judgment, and for himself he begged to say that there would be a good many repentances before this movement had reached its goal. Yes, repentances on that side of the House. He would say without any acrimony or feeling that hon. Members opposite would occupy the Benches on his side of the House in the ordinary accidents of time and fortune, and quite apart from the ordinary rewards of virtue. He said, with an absolute sense of conviction, that in opposing this movement, as they were doing, they were alienating the best thought and feeling of the Colonies. He said that because he thought he had more communication with the men who represented the opinion of the Colonies than any other man, except those who sat on the Front Bench of the House, and he said to hon. Members opposite that in the somewhat violent criticisms they had made on the action of the Colonies last week concerning their contributions to the Navy they did nothing to advance the end which they all aimed at, namely, to see a common contribution from all the Colonies to the defence of the Empire. But they would not get it by constantly nagging and by petty and petulant speeches in this House, such as he had heard ever since he entered it, upon the question of the Colonial contribution. Hon. Members thought it easy for the Colonies to understand how it was that they ought to contribute for the defence of the Empire. The Colonies thought it extraordinary that we should not understand how it was that a commercial union might be for the benefit of all. He would quote a portion of a letter he had received from a colonist—

> "I notice an expectation in some of your circles that the Colonies should throw themselves into this movement. I do not think that such action would be wise at this juncture."

Could hon. Members wonder why? Were they to incorporate into local politics a great Imperial issue until we had decided whether we would present to them that great Imperial issue or not? The writer also said—

> "I am surprised that so little use has been made of the official Paper put in by the Canadian Ministers at the Imperial Conference of 1902."

If he remembered rightly these Imperial Papers embodied not only a wish to give preference to this country, but a distinct promise that they would, when they returned to their own countries, present to their Parliaments proposals for preference. Since that time they had given us a preference of 33⅓ per cent. It was not a great deal. It had only doubled the trade of Canada with this country during the last seven years. Could any Member on the Opposition side of the House say that the Colonies had not given us an earnest of what they meant. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean had said that the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was like the last sermon of a ritualistic parson before going over to the Church of Rome. Remembering how he was thrilled by the problems of Greater Britain and by the ends the right hon. Gentleman desired to see achieved for the Colonies, he felt that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was like the last effort of an evangelistic parson before turning infidel. The right hon. Gentleman represented a feeling which was common on the Opposition side of the House—a feeling of scepticism, agnosticism, and doubt. They would not believe, but he ventured to say that they would have an opportunity of rectifying their opinions when they themselves came officially in contact with the Colonial Administrations of the future. Whatever Party was in power they would do well not to reject those offers without inter-communion, by conference or otherwise, with the statesmen of the Colonies. If we were patient the Colonies would give much more than an occasional contribution to the defence of the Empire; they would give us the opportunity of commercial union.

* LIEUTENANT - COLONEL GEORGE KEMP (Lancashire, Heywood) said he rose to make a few remarks in support of the vote of censure. Although this was the first time he had spoken on that side of the House, he had not suddenly come to the conclusion that it was his duty to do so. He put aside all questions on which he had differed from the Government, such as the Chinese Labour question, the Licensing Bill, and the Army question, believing that if there was only the fiscal question it was his duty to oppose this Government. He regretted having to part from old friends, but there was only one clear issue before them—were they in favour of free trade or of protection and preferences involving the taxation of food? He had held the opinion since last October that the weight of the Government would ultimately be thrown into the scale of protection. He would ask the hon. Member for Gravesend what was Canada prepared to give us on our woollen goods.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: What is this country prepared to give Canada on her corn?

* LIEUTENANT - COLONEL GEORGE KEMP said the hon. Gentleman seemed not to understand that we in England started on a different basis from Canada. We let her goods come in here free. He had asked the supporters of the Birmingham policy in the Division he represented in Lancashire what they could say for colonial preference, and there was not one man in any of the clubs throughout the Division who

had a word to say in favour of colonial preference. He asked the Unionist free-traders whether this was a time to shrink back, to take cover and avoid the fight. What would their followers think if they either abstained from voting or voted with the Government? The country understood a fighter, and the followers of the Unionist free-traders would say that there was a fighter on the one side and not on the other side. Any responsibility there was for this vote of censure rested on the heads of the Government and of the Prime Minister, and he trusted that the free-traders in the House, if they believed, as he believed, that the Birmingham policy would be the ruin of the country and the cause of the disintegration of the Empire, would not by their action seem to acquiesce in it or acquiesce in the policy of a Government which, having been elected to carry out one policy, did its best to promote its exact opposite.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he repudiated the notion of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich that the policy of the Conservative Party was identified with the doctrine of *laissez faire*. The legislation of the Conservative Party had been totally opposed to that doctrine. The hon. Member for Durham had said that the members of the Government who held free-trade opinions had not had liberty given to them of expressing their opinions. He himself could not reconcile that view with the fact that the hon. Member voted for a Resolution proposed in that House welcoming the assurances of certain members of the Government that they were opposed to protection and taxation on corn, and it was well within the memory of every one that the Lord Chancellor and the Postmaster-General had expressed strong free-trade opinions.

MR. ELLIOT: I think my hon. friend must be mistaken in citing the Lord Chancellor as having expressed strong free-trade opinions.

MR. J. F. HOPE thought that what he said was absolutely correct. He could not very well understand the hon. Member's position. He was as staunch a Unionist as anyone in that House, but he must know that, if the Resolution were carried that the Union would be in danger, that our policy in South Africa would be in danger, and that the maintenance of a strong Army and Navy would be in danger. Why had he raised all these questions? Could it only be for the sake of the barren claim of an economic doctrine? If the Resolution were carried it would introduce the principle of tests into our political life, and establish in it a new "*quicunque vult.*" It would mean that whoever entered into political life should of necessity hold the Cobdenite faith. If this principle of tests were admitted, how would the Government of Lord Aberdeen have stood when there were in it six Whigs, six Peelites, and one Radical? This question ought to be judged on its merits and not in the light of any old tradition. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had put forward a great ideal. Although some of them were not convinced that the exact details of the proposals were the best, or were necessary to the attainment of the ideal, nevertheless, they must all give the right hon. Gentleman credit for the grandeur of the conception and the courage with which he had put it forward. Let it be judged on its merits, and not merely because it ran counter to a theory which had held domination over the minds of Englishmen for some time. There had been other theories in the past which were equally considered by public opinion to be vital to our national life; but these theories had disappeared and it could not be said that this last theory of our grandfathers was to stand for ever. The scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham might be right or it might be wrong, but if it was sound, they could not resist it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that in the speech which he had delivered the Member for West Birmingham had thrown his lasso over the Prime Minister, and, he thought, had very effectively caught him. Last week it was "stand and wait." To-day it was "stand and deliver." The right hon. Gentleman had been perfectly straight in regard to the course he had taken, and he had no quarrel with the political position which the right hon. Gentleman had created, so far as the right hon. Gentleman was concerned. He was evidently in favour of testing the opinion of the country on these proposals. The right hon. Gentleman, it should be noted, commanded 200 supporters on the Ministerial side of the House. That meant that a majority of the Members of the House were in favour of a dissolution. The Prime Minister, with a minority, for reasons of his own, withstood the desire for an appeal to the judgment of the country upon this great issue. After their recent experiences the Opposition were naturally anxious for a dissolution. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, on the other hand, had not much reason for satisfaction. No doubt when the dissolution came there would be a good many fiscal reform furnaces blown out. The most important thing in the right hon. Gentleman's speech was the way he had endeavoured to commit the Prime Minister to his position, without any challenge or contradiction from the Prime Minister. He said that the Prime Minister had assured him that he sympathised with his scheme of colonial preference, even if it should involve a slight taxation of food. He went further. He said that all the Prime Minister was pledged to was not to propose such a policy to the present Parliament, and that what they meant to propose to the next Parliament was not the business of anybody. He asked the Prime Minister whether that really was his position. Of course they were entitled to know the Prime Minister's position with regard to a 10 per cent. tariff all round. As he understood from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, the Prime Minister was only pledged so far as the present Parliament was concerned, but that he was not pledged not to go in for that in the next Parliament if he had a majority. The right hon. Gentleman had been holding out in the hope of something turning up. Supposing something did turn up and he was returned to power, did he hold that his pledge would extend to the next Parliament? That was a question he had never answered although it had been put to him by the country and by hon. Members opposite.

What was the position at present? Here was the volunteer fleet of the right hon. Member for Birmingham raiding the high seas. Had it the Prime Minister's commission, or was it a piratical commission? It had sunk some very good vessels. It had sunk the Member for Croydon. Was that an act of piracy or had it the Prime Minister's commission? He thought really they were entitled to know that, and he trusted that right hon. Gentleman would answer the question although it came from a private Member. This was the sort of thing that had been going on. The Prime Minister and the Member for Birmingham recommended the same candidates at elections. They might not have the same concern, but they seemed to have running powers over each other's lines. Would they come forward at the next meeting of shareholders with a scheme of amalgamation? The Prime Minister had declared his sympathy with colonial preference, including the taxation of food. There was only one limit he put upon it. He said "I sympathise with it; I think it a great idea, and I should like to see it carried out, But it has one fatal defect: it is unpopular." The right hon. Member for West Birmingham admitted that it was unpopular, but that did not deter him from placing it before the country, and that was a position they could understand. But supposing the right hon. Member for West Birmingham succeeded in his campaign—as he naturally thought he would. That was the very essence of his courage. It was his hopefulness—and the last obstacle to the Prime Minister's conversion would be gone. Great was the Prime Minister's deference to public opinion. There were certain limits to his deference to public opinion. The reconstruction of the Army—that was a question to be decided by public opinion. Was the Militia to continue to exist or not—that was a question for public opinion. Was the whole Empire to be reconstructed—that was a question for public opinion. If public opinion was in favour of it he would accept it. The only limit to that deference to public opinion was when public opinion asked him to retire. Then he said, "I draw the line there; that would involve a disaster to the Empire."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said that.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that evidently the right hon. Gentleman had not read the whip he received yesterday. On this point the right hon. Gentleman said his conscience was touched and he became a passive resister on the spot. Frankly, he did not think the position of the Government was a cerditable one. Why was the right hon. Member for West Bristol not present supporting his policy? It was for this reason. His opinion was that this policy would be beaten and that then it would be abandoned. There was no conviction, no principle behind it. It was purely a question of popularity or otherwise, and he thought it would be abandoned. Well, the right hon. Gentleman knew his Party better than he did. In his view, the right hon. Member for West Birmingham and the Government were climbing the same peak. The right hon. Gentleman was far in advance, but they were both on the same road. The right hon. Gentleman took all risks. He bridged the chasms, he cut the steps in the ice, he found the safe ways, he negotiated the difficult rocks. If he succeeded the Government would allow themselves to be dragged up behind him and they would rally round his flag on the summit. But if he failed they meant to cut the rope. That was the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol.

AN HON. MEMBER ON THE MINISTERIAL BENCHES: How do you know?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if these were not the right hon. Gentleman's opinions, the right hon. Member for West Bristol would have been there to turn out the Government. He ventured to suggest that that was a very mean conception of the duty of a great Government to a great question. The Prime Minister's position was clear in one respect. He said to his Party, "Don't press me about this thing. The taxation of food does not bother me, or whether the federation of the Empire on these lines will succeed, but I am in difficulties and have to get out the best way I can." It reminded him of the speech of an Athenian general who thus addressed his men—"Fellow soldiers who are posted with me in this dangerous situation, I conjure you in your urgent extremity to throw away all superfluous wisdom." That was the policy of the Prime Minister. It was a position which no House of Commons which had any regard for its own dignity or for the efficiency and power of the Government could ever tolerate without making its opinion perfectly clear.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This debate has been in my opinion a very good debate. I think the speeches from both sides of the House—including the speech which we have just heard—have been of their respective kinds very excellent, with some of those exceptions which I am afraid we must always expect in a debate which lasts through a full Parliamentary day. But none of that credit, I think, is due to the Resolution we are discussing. It seems to me to be one of the most foolish that ever was put upon the Paper of the House of Commons. An hon. Gentleman, speaking for a few moments from the unaccustomed position of the other side of the House, said that this Resolution gave us, for the first time, I understand, the opportunity for a fair and square division upon the respective merits of free trade and protection. Let me read the Resolution which affords us this happy ground for our manœuvres. [AN HON. MEMBER on the OPPOSITION Benches: On the Foxhills.] It is a perfectly justifiable analogy. Now this is the Motion:—"That this House regrets that certain of His Majesty's Ministers have accepted official positions in a political organisation which has formally declared its adhesion to a policy of preferential duties involving the taxation of food." Are Gentlemen opposite so ill-acquainted with the real essence of the contest between free trade and protection that they think the issue is raised, except in the most remote and indirect fashion, by that Motion? The truth is that the whole interest of this debate has turned upon matters which are only just within the limits of order, as connected with the Motion, and even the right hon. Gentleman who put it upon the Paper and moved it hardly touched upon it at all. I suppose I must pay it, in passing, the respectful attention of telling the House why it is foolish, as it appears to me. The principles laid down by the right hon. Gentleman, both in regard to Ministerial responsibility and the relations of Ministers of the Crown to the organisations belonging to their Parties seem to me to be utterly subversive, not merely of the constitutional traditions of this country, but of any traditions which we could allow to be framed so as to govern the action of our successors.

As regards the Ministers of the Crown, an hon. friend of mine well acquainted with the Colonies who touched upon this question quoted a sentence from Lord Macaulay about the traditions which prevailed a little more than a hundred years ago. That quotation indicates what nobody can doubt, that in the gradual evolution of this House of Commons two things have happened. One is that if you are to carry on the business of the country it is necessary that Party ties should be drawn closer than they were in Mr. Pitt's time, and, in the second place, that Ministerial responsibility and the absolute identity of opinion with regard to current matters is a new doctrine, but, I think, an inevitable doctrine. I do not quarrel with it. I think it is not the old tradition of this House. There was a time, and not very long ago either, in our constitutional history when no attempt was made to draw as tight as the right hon. Gentleman desires for the moment—I fancy only for the moment—the ties among members of the same Government. Let us remember, as the constitutional question has arisen, that there is something more at stake in this part of the question than the fate of this or any other Ministry. What is the principle upon which Governments are formed, and upon which they can only be formed? I have been reproached by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that I did not give a pledge with regard to my opinions not only in the next Parliament, but the Parliament after, and I suppose all Parliaments until in the course of years I shall be withdrawn from these debates.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I said the next Parliament.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know how long the hon. Gentleman's tests are to apply, nor does he. But I am not only to be expected to give pledges as to what my own opinions are to be months or years hence, when the whole circumstance of the case may have changed, but all my colleagues are expected to give pledges that they shall always agree with me upon all subjects that are to be brought forward. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh!"] I think that is not merely absurd, but I think anything at all resembling it would be wholly destructive of every form of Cabinet or Parliamentary government. I will not say, although it is obvious, that it makes impossible any coalition, because I am not sure that coalitions in this country have been great successes; but whatever the crisis the country was passing through, whatever the distribution of Party in this House, however difficult it may be to form a homogeneous Ministry out of a single Party, you must put coalition on one side. The Opposition say, "Here are gentlemen who are only agreed upon the policy of the session. But we want more than that. We want them to subscribe to some test to show that after this Parliament is dissolved, and possibly after they have been out of office for years, after Parliament is dissolved, they are to come back one homogeneous body, subscribing to one single system of fiscal doctrine." I am certainly not going to make any pledge for myself, and I am certainly not going to ask any pledges from my friends. After all, the only question immediately raised is whether a Minister of the Crown ought to belong to an association representing his Party in which resolutions are passed with which he does not agree, or in which he is not obliged to agree. [AN HON. MEMBER: Do you or do you not agree?] Well, Sir, I remember Lord Randolph Churchill voting for a resolution in favour of protection. That did not bind the leaders of the Party in his day, nor their successors. I do not know why less liberty is to be allowed now. For my own part, I think it wholly improper that any attempt should be made to control the resolutions passed by the National Union of Conservative Associations. No attempt has ever been made to control them. I do not know how right hon. Gentlemen opposite manage their affairs. Perhaps their followers are better drilled but, unless I have been misinformed—I do not know whether it is true or not—the Trade Union Conference in 1893 passed a resolution in favour of the nationalisation of all the mineral resources of the country, and the hon. Member for Morpeth, for whom I have as great a respect as I have for any Member of the House, was a member of that conference, and also a member of Mr. Gladstone's Government. They passed such a resolution, and why should they not? And why should the hon. Gentleman not have remained a member of that Government? This idea of restricting the liberties of these representative institutions may find favour upon that side of the House, but as far as I am concerned, they shall never find favour upon this side, and I shall never recommend friends of mine who belong to the Liberal Unionist section of the Party to bind themselves in the sort of fetters which apparently commend themselves to the right hon. Gentleman opposite and his friends.

We have been told that the Government ought to speak with one voice. I think a Government ought to speak with one voice; but if you want them to speak with one voice, human nature being what it is and human beings modifying their opinions as they do, it must be for a limited time. Can you ask The members of a Cabinet to agree for more than the Parliament in which that Cabinet leads? If you are to lay down that doctrine, how on earth is the Radical Party ever to come into power? I quite admit that the divisions on this side at this moment are greatly occupying public attention and are greatly embarrassing, if you please, to the members of the Party themselves; but one must get accustomed to a disease. Everybody knows that there is an immunity derived from long suffering under certain microbic invasions. Hon. Gentlemen are immune from this particular disease, because, as everybody knows, they have had divisions from time immemorial. And their divisions are far more fundamental now and are going to remain more fundamental than any which exist on this side. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] Well, now, who is bold enough to challenge this? Here we have hon. Gentlemen opposite, some of whom are fervent believers in Home Rule. There are others who think it is an academic question, like the right hon. Member for East Fife, and there are others who hate the name. How many of them would agree that we ought to nationalise the mineral resources of the country? I see some hon. Gentlemen who would be seriously embarrassed if that particular policy were ever carried into effect. In truth, at this moment they are agreed on only one subject, and that is the question how they are most quickly to get into office. Their eagerness may be a matter of surprise, but it is a perfectly legitimate object of ambition. But, after all, it is an inadequate bond for a great Party. It hardly provides a sufficient basis for agreement on which to carry on a solid and patriotic policy for the country at large. I do not complain of their difficulties, from which I anticipate considerable personal enjoyment in the future, but what I do complain of is that they should turn upon us and reproach us as if they were a united family, bound together in the bonds of brotherly love, having but one opinion upon all the great questions that can divide the country, including fiscal reform. I think that absurd. And inasmuch as it is absurd, I perhaps may be allowed to leave the Motion which is immediately before the House and deal with more interesting and important questions.

I cannot conceal from myself that this vote of censure, though nominally directed against Lord Lansdowne and Lord Selborne, against my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury and other of my Liberal Unionist friends and colleagues, is in reality and in truth a vote of censure on myself. I have no objection to that. I have very little complaint indeed to make of the extraordinary wealth of adjectives hurled at my head in the course of this debate, and in previous debates on the same subject, in connection with the line I have thought it my duty to pursue. I have made a list of these adjectives; it is rather long; but perhaps I can sum it up by reminding the House that I have been accused of being a kind of Machiavelli trying by mere dexterity, mere manœuvring—the phrase was loudly cheered—having no strong opinions of my own, of being desirous only of maintaining, as far as may be, the union of the Party which I lead, and of keeping office for myself and friends as long as possible. That is the expurgated substance of the attacks made upon me this afternoon and on previous occasions. Of course there are a certain number of politicians whose whole stock-in-trade consists in first misunderstanding and then in misrepresenting their opponents. I hope and believe that there are few in this Assembly, and if there are, I never wish to deprive a poor man of his livelihood. I am the last man to complain of any Gentleman who thinks it is the proper and best way of carrying on a controversy; but I believe that the vast majority of Gentlemen on both sides of the House are not desirous to indulge in deliberate misrepresentation, and are really anxious, if it does not cost them too much trouble, to make themselves acquainted with the point of view even of those with whom they most differ. It is to the second class and not to the first class I appeal. I do not in the least mind. I think the House will give me credit when I say that no man minds hard words less than I do. I am not raising this point in order to defend myself and to make an attack on any individual who may have thought it part of his duty to attack me; but the misunderstanding is so great that something may be gained by clearing it away. Hon. Gentlemen think that I have treated them badly by clouding my opinions in ingenious phrases, by never making a declaration of policy, by attempting to hold the balance between the two extremes, and by various Parliamentary artifices which, if ever justifiable, are not justifiable in regard to any prolonged discussion of any national issue. My view is that I think I have done more than any man in my position, than any previous Minister or Prime Minister, has ever done to make his position absolutely clear.

I have not dealt with these subjects for the first time, nor since the fiscal controversy came into an acute stage. I have been interested in economics for many years. I have spoken on them before the fiscal question came before the country in its present stage. I have spoken and written upon them frequently since. Any one who will take the trouble to read through these various speeches and writings I have made in the last twenty years of my political life will see that everything I have said on these economic subjects belongs to one consistent body of doctrine. It is possible, though I doubt it, that there may be here and there a verbal inconsistency; I have not read these back numbers, but that there is a substantial inconsistency I do not believe, and it is evident to any one who looks at the documents in a fair and honest spirit, that from first to last I have uttered the opinions I formed quite independently of the present controversy. No man, however much trouble he took, can preserve that verbal consistency for all these years. I have taken no trouble. I have spoken on each occasion for the occasion, and any critic with the smallest perspicuity or fitted with an elementary knowledge of the subject discussed would see that the docrines I have recommended to the country are not doctrines intended to harmonise any possible extremes, not doctrines to meet a particular occasion in a particular way,not examples of superhuman dexterity combined with superhuman infamy, but simply an exposition of views long held and maintained, consistent with themselves, economically sound, and which even the trade economists who differ from my conclusions will admit are not open to the charge that I had fallen a prey to any idols of the market-place or to the popular fallacies into which we are apt to fall when addressing popular audiences on these great and difficult questions.

I do not charge hon.Gentlemen opposite with any desire at any time to deliberately misrepresent; and that being so, I have tried to think why it is that they have attributed to me motives which were never in my mind and doctrines which I never professed. I believe it to be due to two causes. In the first place they think that I am bound, holding the general views that I have expressed in the country, to explain in detail how, if I am a member of a Government returned to power after the next general election, I mean to carry my views out. I think that a most unreasonable claim, and one that I would not give way to on any subject on earth. Think of any policy you choose. The Minister who should not merely express his general concurrence with a general line of policy, but should go into details as to the way in which it was to be carried out, would evidently lay himself open to such a degree of criticism as would embarass both himself and his colleagues in a manner which I do not mean to do. I do not think that any Gentleman on the Front Bench opposite would ever think of doing it. Why ask me to do what no Prime Minister has ever done before? Why ask me to go into details when I have been perfectly clear and explicit with regard to general principles? All that can be asked of me is general principles, and those I have given in unmistakable terms.

What is the second ground of misconception on which, I think, hon. Gentlemen innocently have made me a victim? They are unconsciously irritated at not being able to squeeze my opinions—which are my opinions—definitely into any of the divisions in which they prefer to carry on political controversy. They have one or two epithets on which either they plume themselves or which they throw at the heads of their opponents; and if my doctrines do not exactly square with or fit into these hard-and-fast divisions they think I am to blame. I would remind them that it is possible that they may be to blame—that it is not the speaker or writer, but the hearer and the writer who have misunderstood. I say it with all respect. To-day we had an instance of it. The hon. and learned Member for South Shields made one of his characteristic speeches, one of those speeches with all its characteristics of style. He ended by saying that a certain pamphlet which I wrote carried on the face of it protectionist doctrine. He then proceeded to give not the words of the pamphlet—naturally he thought he could express my views far better than I could express them myself, for I do not pretend to rival his mastery of exposition. I acknowledge him my superior there, but where he failed was to understand what I meant. It may be my obscurity. I have been told that there are gentlemen who do not understand that document. But it is not because I have used ambiguous phrases or that I have wrapped up my meaning in vague and cloudy rhetoric. I have attempted in that pamphlet, as in my speeches, to state with the utmost precision, in phrases as clear as my poor powers of style enable me to use, the belief that I really entertain.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL rose, Mr. A. J. BALFOUR remaining standing.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has no right to continue standing unless the right hon. Gentleman gives way.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR sat down.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: I only desire to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will answer the Question of the noble Lord about the 10 per cent. duty on manufactured goods.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has no right to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman with a Question of that kind.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have been asked, among other things, whether I am a protectionist or a free-trader—two terms which particularly commend themselves to hon. Gentlemen in conducting this controversy. Well, I am a free-trader. I have always been a free-trader, I quite admit that when I hear free trade expounded by some of its disciples on the other side I begin to hesitate as to the accuracy of the definition. There is the hon. and learned Member for South Shields, for example, who told us that free trade was co-extensive with human morality—a rather serious reflection, when we remember that that would confine human morality to the British Isles and the Turkish Empire. But in truth, though I do not think that the hon. Member for South Shields knows much about free trade—[HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."] Well, I never make these assertions without reasons. I have given one reason; I will give another. The hon. and learned Member said that it was the essence of the free-trade doctrine that in a community of nations where free trade existed, that must be necessarily the best for all parties concerned.

MR. ROBSON: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will pardon me for interrupting him, but I uttered neither of those propositions. I never dreamt of saying that free trade was co-extensive with human morality; indeed, I said nothing of the kind. Nor did I make the second point.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, I think if the hon. Gentleman looks at his speech he will see that I had reason for my views, but, of course, if he disavows them I am the last man to press them upon him. But whether the hon. and learned Gentleman was accurate or not as to the essence of free trade, I thought an excellent definition of it was given by my hon. friend the Member for Durham, who made one of the many good speeches made during the debate. He described protection as a policy which aimed at producing high prices in order to benefit the manufacturers. Well, that is a very good definition, I think, and that certainly has never been my principle. It has never occurred to me, nor have I ever suggested in public or private, that the policy of this country should be to produce high prices in order to benefit the manufacturers. But I think that free trade, or at all events the older school of free-trade economists, have shown themselves, naturally, incapable of foreseeing all the conditions with which we have to deal now. One of the things in which they have shown themselves most wanting is in the power of foreseeing that protection adopted by our rivals in trade would not produce all the evils to those rivals in neutral markets and in our own market which they anticipated. The old doctrine of free trade and protection was this—that if a country had protection it would in the first place render itself incapable of keeping to the front in the matter of invention, having no healthy competition. Invention would slacken, production would diminish in efficiency, and, therefore, that country, however secure it might be in its own markets in consequence of its protectionist system, would not be able to compete with a free-trade country like ourselves in neutral markets. Well, that is all wrong. I think it was a most natural hypothesis, but I think experience has clearly shown that it is incorrect. The three great manufacturing protective countries which we need most to consider are the United States of America, Germany, and France, and I venture to say all those three countries show at least as much power and skill in adapting new scientific researches to industrial purposes as we have ourselves shown. That was the first mistake that was made. Then they greatly underrated the evils that would ensue to a free-trade country in commercial contact with great protectionist countries on account of the mobility of movable capital and of the enormous increase in the amount of immovable capital—which requires movable capital to make it worth anything—which was part of the equipment of the free trade-country. It is too late to go into an analysis of this point now, though it is extremely important. It is one you will not see mentioned in the older text-books at all, but I am perfectly convinced the more you study the conditions of modern industry the more you will see that these protectionist countries obtain an unfair advantage over a non-protectionist country. The last of these errors which I wish to mention is that which is due to the older economists not having realised that any fiscal arrangement which gave a protected country the power of running its mills in certain industries at an even rate gave them an artificial advantage over countries which, owing to their free trade, could not run at that even rate. The hon. Member for Oldham laughs,——

Mr. EMMOTT: I laughed because the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said a few months ago that 10,000,000 tons of iron and steel would be dumped into this country from America, whereas the facts are that there is a much greater stoppage of work there now than in this country.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am making my own speech, and am expressing my own opinions to the best of my ability; and I do not know why the right hon. Gentleman interrupts me on a totally irrelevant issue. It is perfectly true that these protectionist countries carry out this process at great cost to themselves, but that is no comfort to us. They do carry it out, and in my judgment it is part of the duty of those who are responsible for the policy of this country to see whether the evils which protection is producing in neutral markets as in home markets, as well, of course, as in protected markets, cannot by some means be mitigated. Removed they cannot be, but I do not despair of their being mitigated by any Administration which is not hide-bound in maxims which were applicable in the days not only of Adam Smith, not only of Ricardo, but much later than that, but which are not applicable to the modern conditions of industry.

I have attempted within the conditions of time to summarise certain of the strictly economic doctrines which I hold, which I have endeavoured elsewhere to explain, and which I believe are of enormous importance to this country. But political economy is not the only thing to be considered. No nation worthy of the name has ever considered political economy only, and, when you go outside the bounds of political economy, you have to consider how much you lose and how much you gain morally and materially by any particular policy which may be suggested. I will put a very extreme case, because extreme cases more easily illustrate general principles. Suppose it could be shown, which I do not think can ever be shown, that not only did our race utterly deteriorate when transplanted to urban districts, but that there was no possible hope of making those urban districts so sanitary that the evil effects upon the physical well-being of our people could ever be obviated, is there a man in this House who would not say that, at whatever cost, means must be taken to keep a large population in the agricultural districts? That would not be a protective policy, that would be a sanitary policy. Then it is evident that everything turns on a matter of degree—what you give in the way of money and in other ways, and what you get in the way of money and in other ways, whether it be in national greatness, wealth, or health. It is a balance of good and evil. It is perfectly plain that there are circumstances under which it would be the duty of this country to put a tax on food. I do not say any such circumstance has arisen; I do not think it has. When, therefore, I am asked to lay it down as a principle that this country is never to put any tax, however small, upon food, how can I lay down such a principle? I was a member of the Government that put a tax on food to raise revenue, and most of my free-trade friends voted for that. If you put a tax on food to get revenue you may put it on for other purposes which are as great as, or greater, than revenue.

So much for the theory. Then I am asked whether I think a tax ought now to be put on for any purpose of colonial preference. I have expressed my view in the clearest language on that point, and I see no reason for altering it. That reason is not founded, as I understand the reason of some of my hon. friends is, upon some immutable scientific and economic ground. It is based upon the fact that, I believe, for historic reasons, there is a feeling about all taxation of food, however insignificant—or, at all events, all taxation of wheat, because we tax food already — altogether in excess of any damage which a small tax is likely to produce. I have expressed that view over and over again. Anybody who looks back upon my speech on the introduction of the corn tax will see my economic views upon that subject put quite clearly. That was long before the fiscal controversy arose. They will also see these views put to the deputation which met me when the corn tax was repealed, and the views which I then expressed before the fiscal controversy started are the views which I hold now. Where is the deception? Where is the shiftiness; where is the lack of definiteness in this statement of policy? But if I am asked whether I think colonial preference is a cause worthy of our attention, I must express my strong dissent from the views of my noble friend, admirably expressed earlier in the evening. He thinks that to take the Colonies into our confidence upon foreign affairs is quite a simple operation. Well, it is difficult enough for the Government to take the House of Commons into its confidence on foreign affairs. In fact, there are always aspects of foreign affairs which never are and never ought to be made a question of debate in this House. How, then, is it possible to carry out my noble friend's suggestion of drawing closer the union with the Colonies in that way? Whether in time to come some great constitutional inventor will find a method of having a representative institution dealing with the whole affairs of the Empire I know not, but I think my noble friend will admit that at present we are very far indeed from that. But as to the ideal which my right hon. friend has sketched out, that we should draw, if possible, closer the commercial bonds between us and the Colonies—that it is our business to find out what they can give and what we can give, what they want and what we want—of that I never have had a doubt and I have never expressed a doubt. I have always told the House and the country, and my views are unalterably fixed upon that subject. [OPPOSITION cries of "What are they?"] That being so, it seems to me that I have absolved myself to-night from the charge, if I ever was open to the charge, of keeping the House in ignorance of my views. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] I may not have dissipated the ignorance of the Member for Oldham. But to more impartial, I will not say to more favourable, hearers, whether on that side of the House or on this, I think I may say that the statement I have made to-night, consistent in every particular with the state ments I have made before, is lacking neither in clearness nor in candour.

*MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): The right hon. Gentleman began his speech with something in the nature of a complaint that the debate had travelled beyond the limits of the Motion. I must say he has bettered any example that has been set him in the course of his own observations. If the debate has gone beyond the scope of the Motion, as it undoubtedly has, that is largely due to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman will not allow us any other opportunity of discussing the fiscal question except on a vote of censure. The right hon. Gentleman, conscious of the embarrassments of a position which, as his speech shows, is logically indefensible, has, not for the first nor for the second time, endeavoured to escape from the difficulty by a very familiar, but a very futile rhetorical device—the device, I mean, of asking what, in some contingency which has not occurred, a body of persons who are not at present responsible for the government of the country would do or would not do. The right hon. Gentleman appears to forget, but the House does not need to be reminded, that we are discussing the conduct of the responsible Ministers of the Crown in relation to a question which does not belong to the dim and remote future, but which is at this moment, and will remain until the general election, the paramount issue in our domestic politics. Of what relevance is it, when that is the subject under discussion, to put hypothetical questions as to what somebody else would do in another set of circumstances? Sir Robert Peel defined the function of the Leader of the Opposition perfectly clearly when he said, "I will prescribe when I am called in." The right hon. Gentleman said, "I am not in." He is in. He is in the sick room, at the bedside of the patient, a patient who, according to the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, unless some drastic method is appiled, will soon be in *articulo mortis*. The right hon. Gentleman who is in, and is the chief physician of the body politic at such a time, thinks it consistent with his duty to the House of Commons and the country to mumble a half-hearted approval of some homœopathic but undefined measure of retaliation while, as this Motion points out, he allows and even encourages his colleagues to go into an adjoining room and start a loud agitation in favour of a good strong searching dose of protection. When the right hon. Gentleman seeks to find some way of escape from the difficulties of his position by imagining difficulties for us, I make this answer. When a Liberal Government is sitting on those Benches, if it pursues the same ambiguous strategy as he and his colleagues are pursuing in relation to Home Rule or in relation to Disestablishment or in relation to any other question, I care not what, the right hon.Gentleman, if he is sitting on this Bench, will have abundant opportunity and,in my opinion, will have ample justification for moving a vote of censure upon them.

It is curious that the right hon. Gentleman does not yet appear to understand the gravamen of the charge conveyed in the Resolution of my right hon. friend. He speaks of the action of those colleagues who have joined—I was going to say the Tariff Reform League, for it really is the same thing—as if they had become members of the committee of the Psychical Research Society. He ignores the whole history of this matter. I need not go back as far as the resignation of the five Cabinet Ministers last autumn. One of them, the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, pointed out this afternoon with perfect clearness that the only point on which he for his part differed from the Prime Minister, was in their relative views as to the ripeness of public opinion. Their aims were absolutely the same. Their methods would be the same, only they differ as to whether public opinin owould stand it or not. Public opinion sometimes ripens very rapidly. Sometimes, on the other hand, public opinion makes a very slow response to the most assiduous and skilful agricultural operations. I shall never withhold the tribute to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham of my opinion that, however deeply and profoundly we differ from him, and no one differs from him more profoundly than I do, he took the only manly course when he laid down his office—an office which he cherished, and in which even his most severe critics will admit he performed great services to the Empire—and went out into the wilderness as a missionary, regardless of the consequences and determined to convert his fellow-subjects to what he believes to be the truth. That is the position and the only position, except indeed, that of those colleagues who retired on entirely different but equally conscientious grounds, which history and posterity will regard with honour or even with tolerance.

I must come to a later period, if the House will forgive me for bringing them back to the Motion. What was this meeting which the colleagues of the right hon. Gentleman attended and at which they were created officers of this association. It was not an ordinary meeting of the Liberal Unionist Association to denounce Home Rule, or alien immigration, or any of the other spectres of which some of them are afraid. This was a meeting to celebrate the triumph and reap the fruits of a successful revolution. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had succeeded in transforming the association from an oligarchy managed by dukes and people of that sort into a republic. And the peculiarity of this new republic was this—that, whether from ostracism or voluntary withdrawal, not a single free-trader was to be found within it. The Liberal Unionist organisation had been not only democratised, but purged. It was on such a body, so reconstituted, and at such a moment, that these three members of the Government were invited to accept, and accepted, responsible positions. I will not say much about the resolutions. They knew what those resolutions were. The resolution passed in the afternoon must have been known to them, although it seems to have been doctored and diluted in the evening, in order to suit the less robust digestion of my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies; but it was a resolution in favour of the scheme for preference, and when at the evening meeting Lord Lansdowne, one of the representatives of the Government, made some hedging observations with regard to the difficulties which might attend the realisation of this splendid ideal, we are told that they were received with marked coldness by the audience, and I did not observe that they were repeated, either by the Secretary of State for the Colonies or any subsequent speaker. Now, Sir, just to sum up matters. Here you have three Ministers of the Crown joining a protectionist organisation from which free-traders have been completely excluded. That organisation is a body whose president has declared and does declare that one of its main objects is the promotion of preference, which involves the taxation of food. They join it at a moment when it has formally and explicitly passed a resolution in favour of preference, and they take with them the unabated sympathy of the Prime Minister with the object in view. That was the language used, and yet we are told that all this has no actual political significance, and that, after it all, the Government, as a Government, may be treated as neutral or even hostile to the taxation of food. I say that is flying in the face, not only of probability, but of common sense.

I will pass to the second part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. He was very indignant—I will not say indignant, but surprised, pained, and startled that his opponents should have charged him with playing in this matter a Machiavellian part, that he appeared, at any rate, to collude with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in his schemes and projects. I do not think that charge proceeded in the first instance from the right hon. Gentleman's political opponents. I remember a passage in a great organ of public opinion favourable to the Member for West Birmingham, in which, with many admiring phrases, the right hon. Gentlemen were compared to consummate whist players who understood one another's hands, and who adjusted their play accordingly. It was not with those ignorant, stupid, and malevolent opponents that the charge in the first instance originated. The right hon. Gentleman tells us by way of apology that his whole past economic record is so clear, so consistent, that he who runs may read, and that there is no excuse for any doubt or ambiguity as to his real views. For twenty years, he says, he has been putting forward these same opinions to the public. I could not help distrusting my memory for a moment when I heard this; but I verified my recollection and I have discovered that as lately as June, 1903, he informed us in this House that he should consider he would be ill-performing his duty—

> "I will not say to my own Party, but to the House and to the whole of the country, if I were to profess a settled conviction where no settled conviction exists."

Pretty good for a consistent economist! I remember very well that the right hon.

Gentleman used another phrase about the same time, which he applied to himself and his colleagues. He said they had open minds, and it was for the purpose of settling those unsettled convictions and closing those open minds that the inquiry was ordered, on the pretext of which we were debarred from all effective discussion on the matter. I should not have alluded to this, had the right hon. Gentleman not laid claim to praise for consistency. But whatever may have been his opinions in the past, is there any man now sitting on those Benches who can tell me what his opinions are today? [An HON. MEMBER: Not one.] The right hon. Gentleman was put two or three very plain, unambiguous, and simple questions, and to not one has he vouchsafed an answer. He has told us he is a free-trader. How does he proceed to justify his appropriation of the name? By pointing out that protectionist countries have discovered fundamental errors in the doctrine of free trade, that they have by abandoning free trade *pro tanto* stolen a march on us—the inference being, if these remarks were intended to lead to anything at all, that if we are to hold our own in the race it can only be by abandoning free trade and following their example. The right hon. Gentleman's zeal for free trade is on a par with his economic consistency!

There is another point on which we are more anxious still to obtain information, and that is with regard to this simple question. Is he, or is he not, in favour of the proposals of the Member for West Birmingham? I say no real answer has been given to that. The only answer the right hon. Gentleman has made is this, "I do not think that public opinion in its existing condition would tolerate such a thing." There is no objection in principle. Apparently such a tax would, in the right hon. Gentleman's view, be not inconsistent with what he understands to be the doctrine of free trade, and so far as I am aware—and I am one of those who have tried patiently, laboriously, and conscientiously to understand what he means—so far as I can understand him, his sole objection to the imposition of such a tax is the stupidity or backwardness of the opinion of his fellow-countrymen. Why does he not follow the example of his late colleague? Why does he not join in the crusade to enlighten ignorance and to bring public opinion into conformity with what he says, could it only be carried out, would be a splendid and ennobling idea? I say the net result of the right hon. Gentleman's speech is in exact harmony with the inference we draw from the action of his colleagues, that the Government is a protectionist Government, that their sympathies are with the Member for West Birmingham, and that they are only restrained to the extent that they are restrained from active co-operation by the fear of public opinion. I will not impute to the hon. Gentleman the same motives which he has imputed to us, but I will say that they believe it is of paramount importance to the interests of the Empire that they should retain office. But I must point out that the country makes no distinction whatever between these two policies. The candidate is sent down to the constituency. He may be one of those mealy-mouthed gentlemen who say they cannot see their way at present to go further than the Sheffield programme. Or, on the other hand, he may go down with all the pomp and circumstance, with the cymbals and brass, of the

Tariff Reform League. It makes no difference. The electors do not discriminate between them. They recognise that the return of either would mean a step towards protection; they recognise that the rejection of both is the only rational way to support the cause of free trade. We are told that we ought not to pass this Resolution because of foreign complications, because we might weaken the hands of the Government in face of the world. Is there a Chancellory in Europe which appraises at more than a few months purchase the political existence of this Government? This country at any rate has clearly made up its mind; it only awaits the moment for rendering its verdict and executing its sentence. For my part, I do not believe that even a vote of censure of this House would sensibly impair the remnants of the moral authority of this Government. Nevertheless, it is our duty to-night, on the last occasion this session will afford, to offer to the House of Commons by this Motion the opportunity of giving clear and explicit expression to what we believe to be the national mind in condemnation of what I do not hesitate to describe as a political imposture, than which the annals of our history record none which is, at the same time, more transparent and more grotesque.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 210; Noes, 288. (Division List No. 290.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E. C. (S. Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Fran. H. (Maidstone)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Rt Hn Sir W (Monm'th
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert

Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, JA (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leed, S.)s
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manchr'
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banes, Major George Edward
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Sir E. W (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, RtHn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrel, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, RtHn J. Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Sir Charles G.E. (Notts.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

LEEDS UNIVERSITY BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 2nd August, 1904.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.

Writs and Returns electing the Lord Bellew a Representative Peer for Ireland in the room of the late Viscount Powerscourt, deceased, with the Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland annexed thereto. Delivered (on oath), and Certificate read.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Carlisle Corporation Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Selby Urban District Council Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Dean Forest Bill; Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Holywood Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Lothians Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Moved, That the Order made on the 14th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill. Read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 178).

LEEDS CORPORATION (CONSOLIDATION) BILL.

Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH): My Lords, with regard to this Bill I desire to move the suspension of the Order made on 14th March to the effect that no private Bill brought from the House of Commons should be read a second time after 16th June. I move this only as a prelude to another Motion which I shall place on the Paper for an early day next week. I have not moved it to-day because it is possible that there will be some discussion upon it, and it would not be convenient to have it to-day. This Bill is one of very great magnitude, comprising 372 clauses, and there have been a large number of Amendments made in another place. I wish to give notice in moving the suspension of the Standing Order to-day that I shall propose to the House next week to carry this Bill forward to next session. I will give my reasons on that occasion for moving that Motion.

Moved, "That the Order made on the 14th day of March last, 'That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 16th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed.

PETITIONS.

HIS HIGHNESS MAHENDRA MAHARAJAH MADHAVA SINGH.

Petition of, for redress of grievances; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

Petition in favor of; of Metropolitan Borough of Islington; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition for amendment of; of residents in Hampstead and others; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Report of the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the law relating to compensation for injuries to workmen. Vol. I. Report and Appendices. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVAL BOILERS.

Report of the Committee on Naval Boilers.

ARMY.

Statement showing the financial effect of certain reductions in, and additions to the Army proposed by the Secretary of State for War.

Statement showing the basis on which the estimated extra cost of £25,900,000 for conscription was made.

Particulars regarding the proposed Army Organisation Scheme.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Sixteenth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. Vol. II. List of witnesses and minutes of evidence.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3243. France (Lyons, St. Etienne, and Grenoble).

No. 3244. Germany (Dantzig).

No. 3245. Uruguay.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Forty-eighth Report of His Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners; with Appendix.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES.

Shipping casualties which occurred on or near the coasts, or in rivers and harbours of the United Kingdom, from 1st July, 1902, to 30th June, 1903; and shipping casualties which occurred to British vessels elsewhere than on the coasts of the United Kingdom and to foreign vessels on or near the coasts, or in rivers and harbours of British Possessions abroad, reported during the same period, etc., with charts and appendices.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the County of Suffolk Bill ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed. Read, and agreed to.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

EARL CADOGAN: My Lords, I think the objects of this Bill are sufficiently set forth in the preamble. The County of Suffolk, under the Act of 1888, was divided into two counties, East and West Suffolk, and it is to remedy certain defects and to make plain some difficulties that this Bill is now brought in. I beg to move that it be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Cadogan.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord WOLVERTON: This is identically the Bill which passed through all its stages in your Lordships' House in 1903. Unfortunately, through stress of work in the House of Commons, it was not possible to pass it into law during that session; but this year the Board of Trade have been more fortunate, and the Bill has passed through all its stages in the other House. The principal clauses in the Bill are for the purpose of making the areas for electric lighting purposes, where thought desirable, coterminous with the new municipal areas which were created by the London Government Act of 1899. The only other clause to which I need draw attention is Clause 9, which empowers the Board of Trade to act as arbitrators in the case of any dispute between the parties.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed for Thursday next.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of DERBY: My Lords, the object of this Bill is merely to extend to the graduates of the University of Liverpool certain privileges and exemptions enjoyed by the graduates of all other Universities in England and Wales. These powers were possessed by the Victoria University, which has now been divided into the Victoria Univesity of Manchester, the Liverpool University, and another, and it is sought that the privileges which existed in the joined position should be enjoyed by the separate Universities. I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

LEEDS UNIVERSITY BILL.

Brought from the Commons—read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next. (*The Marquess of Ripon*). (No. 177.)

REGISTRATION OF CLUBS (IRELAND) BILL.

Commons Amendment to Lords Amendments considered (according to Order), and agreed to.

LICENSING BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Debate on the Amendment proposed by the Viscount Peel to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2ª, viz.:—

"To leave out all the words after 'That' for the purpose of inserting the following words: 'This House cannot accept as a satisfactory settlement of the Licensing Question a Bill which creates a perpetual interest in a terminable licence.'"

Resumed (according to order.)

*__Earl SPENCER__: My Lords, I feel some diffidence in rising to continue the very important and interesting debate which we had in this House last night. I am sure we all listened with pleasure and admiration to the speech of the noble Viscount, who occupied a distinguished position for so many years in the other House to the entire satisfaction of that body and with credit to himself. I am confident that the earnestness, the ability, the clearness, and the moderation with which the noble Viscount spoke made a profound impression on your Lordships. As a rule, when a large subject comes up for discussion we arrange ourselves in two Parties, but there are occasions when we may hope to rise above mere Party interests, and when we may take a national view of a great subject.

I am afraid we have to a considerable extent fallen, and naturally fallen—I do not object to it—into two Parties on this great licensing question; but, as I have said, there are exceptions to this rule. I cannot claim the noble Viscount as a follower of my Party, and on this question he takes an independent view. I also rejoice that the right rev. Bench take an independent view on this great question. On a subject of this sort, which, as I shall presently show, affects the morality and the interests of so many thousands of people in the country, we have a right to expect that the Episcopal Bench should take an independent view. We all remember the distinguished Archbishop, the predecessor of the most rev. Primate who spoke with such ability last night. We all remember the force with which the late Archbishop Temple presented subjects to this House, and I would venture to remind your Lordships that Dr. Temple was a member of the Licensing Commission over which the noble Viscount presided, and that he supported the noble Viscount in the strong Minority Report which was laid before that Commission. I hope the views of that distinguished Primate have not been forgotten, and that they may still have influence on the right rev. Bench.

The noble Marquess who spoke last night (the Marquess of Salisbury) rather twitted the noble Viscount for appealing to the right rev. Bench as representing the Church of England. He said the Church of England is not composed only of Bishops and clergy, but includes also the laity. I entirely agree. He then said that though the most rev. Primate in his speech last night was in favour of an important alteration in the Bill, and though the Archbishop had the support of the right rev. Bench, on one notable occasion when laymen were present the resolution against the Bill and in favour of a time limit, which the most rev. Primate had carried in the Upper House of Convocation, was not endorsed. I will leave that to be further explained by some member of the right rev. Bench. I am, I hope, an earnest follower of the Church of England, and in many matters I warmly support it. I could even appeal to some right rev. Prelates opposite to give me a good character in that respect. But, at the same time, I have always felt that, unfortunately, the Church takes up so many political subjects and takes them up in such direct opposition to the Party to which I belong, that I have had sometimes great difficulty in following the Church. I rejoice, therefore, when I find the right rev. Bench supporting the views, and supporting them strongly, which we Liberals hold on this question, which is really one above Party and ought to be treated as a national question. I know—I regret it—that when laymen take part in the discusions of the Church they almost always belong, not to the Party to which I have the honour to belong, but to the Party opposite; and, on the occasion in question, who was it who persuaded this body to vote against the resolution which the most rev. Primate had carried, I believe unanimously, in the Upper House of Convocation? I rather think it was the noble Marquess opposite.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of SALISBURY): No.

*EARL SPENCER: I beg the noble Marquess's pardon. I was certainly informed that he was present. But some of the leading men connected with the Conservative Party were there and took a prominent part in persuading the meeting to follow them in the course which was taken. Therefore when I find the most rev. Primate taking a strong line on a subject of this sort, I cannot but rejoice at it; and I believe that he and those sitting behind him represent what is the dominant view of many of the clergy in every part of the country.

In dealing with a subject of this kind, which has been long before the country, we sometimes overlook the general reasons why the question was raised, and those who may be new to it do not recognise the great anxiety which is felt by many people in the country on the subject. Therefore it is, in my opinion, desirable that we should consider why this measure is necessary, and I cannot do better than quote a passage from a speech of a noble friend of mine who was Home Secretary in the year 1871, when he introduced a great measure on this subject—a measure which I have always regretted was not better considered. I refer to Mr. Bruce, afterwards Lord Aberdare. He stated in his speech in introducing that Bill the reasons why this legislation was necessary, and he stated them in, I think, comprehensive and forcible terms. He said—

"Committees of both Houses of Parliament, the Church in Convocation, ministers of every religious denomination, Judges and magistrates collectively and individually, boards of health and boards of guardians, had all united in proclaiming and impressing upon Parliament the mischiefs which had arisen from the existing facilities for the purchase of intoxicating liquors. Social and sanitary reformers who spent their lives doing good had declared that their labours for the moral and social improvement of their fellow-men were baffled at every turn by the recklessness and moral degradation which sprung from and were occasioned by the liquor traffic. They told us how our prisons, lunatic asylums, and workhouses were filled with inmates whose career had originated in their passion for intoxicating liquors. The back streets, courts, and alleys of most large towns were thronged with a squalid and dangerous population who owed their degradation to the same cause; and even the rural districts were not free from the curse."

Mr. Bruce in those cogent words described the evil which we have to meet. I need not refer to the Report of the Royal Commission over which the noble Viscount presided. They also, in very striking words, commented on this great evil, remarking that hardly any sacrifice would be too great which would result in a marked diminution of this national degradation.

At this moment the actual number of arrests for drunkenness is not diminishing, but increasing. Of prosecutions for drunkenness in England and Wales the average for the five years 1892–6 was 175,628, and for the five years 1897–1901, 204,940, the largest figure being for the year 1901—namely, 210,342. Apart from drunkenness, excessive expenditure on drink is a great economic evil in certain classes. It has been said by some writers of great experience that—

> "It is doubtful if the average family expenditure of the working classes upon intoxicants can be reckoned at less than 6s. per week."

The drink bill of the nation is estimated from the Excise returns at £174,445,217 in 1903, and £179,499,817 in 1902. I admit that that is a slight diminution, but it is a serious indication of what is going on in the country. The evils were illustrated not long ago by a petition headed by the most eminent doctors, and signed by 14,718 registered medical practitioners, urging temperance instruction in the elementary schools on the ground that they have constantly before them the serious physical and moral conditions of degeneracy and disease due to drink and neglect of the laws of health. I shall not say more on that part of the subject.

Now, what has been done recent lyin this matter? In 1902 and 1903 two measures were passed by His Majesty's Government, the taking up of those measures being, I think we may say, greatly due to the action taken by the most rev. Primate, who had previously introduced two Bills, which, though not then accepted by the Government, were in some respects adopted afterwards by them. But those Acts did not deal with the whole subject. What is the remedy which we now say is so necessary? We say that it is essential that the number of licences should be reduced. The enormous excess of licensed houses in this country is a very serious matter. In Chichester the proportion is one licensed house to every 100 persons, having been at one time one to every 79 persons. In Portsmouth the proportion is one to every 153 persons. We heard last night of the enormous excess of licences in Portsmouth, and I may mention that in one street in that town one house in every fourteen is licensed. This great excess in the number of licensed houses is, as I have said, a very serious matter, and both the Minority Report and the Majority Report of the Royal Commission declared that some diminution in the number is essential.

I quite admit that there is some difference of opinion as to whether a diminution in the number of licensed houses will really contribute to lessen drunkenness. I think the noble Marquess opposite rather urged that it would not. At all events, we had several speakers last night who adopted that argument. I admit that a difference in statistics does exist with regard to that. In some cases, no doubt, a diminution in the number of licensed houses has led to a very great decrease in crime, but not so in other districts. The best, but not the only, illustration of what can be done by the uncontrolled discretion of a licensing bench is shown by the Liverpool example. I have before me the official opinion of the Home Office on the reduction of intemperance and crime due to the restrictive licensing policy of the Liverpool city justices. From this document I find that the editor of the Judicial Statistics writes—

> "The most noticeable feature of the figures as to Liverpool is the great decrease during the last decade in offences known to the police and apprehensions. The former were 926·05 per 100,000 in 1890 and 552·50 in 1899. Still more remarkable is the decrease of prosecutions for drunkenness, which fell from 2392·97 per 100,000 in 1890 to 641·58 in 1899, a decline for which, so far as I am aware, there is no parallel. This striking decline is due, it appears, from the information kindly communicated to me by the Chief Constable, to these causes: (a) the decrease in licensed houses; (b) the

trict supervision of licensed houses by the police, and the enforcement of the licensing laws; (c) the suppression of brothels; (d) the action of the licensing magistrates as to the conduct and management of licensed premises."

I think that is an important example of what can be effected by a diminution in the number of public-houses.

With regard to the way in which this evil should be met, we find in existence two schools of thought. First of all there are those who consider that licences are almost, if not quite, absolute property, with just the one condition attaching to them that they may be withheld if the houses are improperly conducted. There are others who rest their case on the exact legal position and claim that no compensation is due to licence-holders, and that under the law licences can always be withheld. Let me for a moment deal with the first school. I am not at all sure that the two noble Marquesses who spoke from the other side may not be classed among those who look upon a licence as almost, if not quite, absolute property. I was rather sorry to find a noble Earl on this side of the House, with whose scheme I have considerable sympathy — Earl Grey — also classed among them. The noble Earl, though he is an advocate of a remarkable scheme, which has a strong supporter in the right rev. Prelate whom I see opposite, the Bishop of Chester, strongly supported the proposals of His Majesty's Government. I confess I greatly regret that, and it seemed to me the noble Earl did so almost entirely because he thought that under the Bill he could get public-houses transferred to the trust more easily than now. I should like to refer for a moment to the enormous value that has grown up in licensed houses. There has been an enormous investment in brewery shares within the last few years. The noble Marquess opposite—he will correct me if I am wrong—said that, of the existing licences, something like 90 or 95 per cent. were held before the legal decision given in 1892.

The MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Before the decision in the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield."

EARL SPENCER: That was in the year 1892; and I think it is a rather startling fact that enormous investments of £91,000,000 odd in brewery shares have been made since this decision in 1892. Then, my Lords, the value attached to these houses is something enormous. I will mention one or two cases. My noble friend Earl Grey was granted a licence at Broomhill. He was informed that if he would consent to sell it he could obtain, without spending a single sixpence, nearly £10,000. Here is another case. Some twelve years ago a public-house was built in a northern colliery village. The actual cost of the building, exclusive of land, was £6,500, but, when licensed, its rental value was fixed at £1,000 a year, while at the present time it is let at a rental of £1,800 a year. In another small northern town a new licence was granted in 1897 to a small house valued at £3,500. On receipt of the licence the owner immediately sold the house for £24,500. I mention these cases as showing what an enormous property has grown up in these houses. This is one of the reasons, no doubt, why so many in the country desire to give this property legislative protection, and the assessment of death duties upon it is put forward as a reason in support of that contention. I cannot myself see the force of that argument at all, for death duties are paid on the actual value of all property at the time of death. Death duties are paid in respect of pictures, houses, and even horses. The actual value is taken at the time of the death of the person concerned. If the house, or picture, or horse which has been valued at £1,000 goes down to £500, or up to £2,000, the persons who valued it on behalf of the Government never take the slightest notice of that. They merely take the actual value of the article at the time of the death of the owner. That is exactly what is done with regard to licences, with all the conditions and all the risks attaching to them.

This is a property which, I regret to say, has fallen under the control of comparatively few hands. In former days public-houses belonged to the tenants, but, unfortunately, of late years great brewery companies have bought up these houses, and it is that fact, and the necessity which they think falls upon them for keeping up the value of these houses, that have led to exhorbitant and illegitimate prices being so often put upon them. I think it is a very dangerous thing that such a power should exist in the country. There is hardly a place now where there are not persons who have shares in these breweries. The brewery companies are highly organised, and it is a serious danger to the political independence of the country to find a new power like this set up with a great organisation in every part of the country.

I have referred to the school who consider a licence almost if not quite absolute property. Now I come to the other school, who say that licences are not an absolute property but a monopoly given for the time being by the State under strict limitations. My noble and learned friend Lord Davey referred last night to a clause in the Act of 1828 which lays down the law on this subject, and which contains these words—

> "Every licence which shall be granted shall be in force for one whole year, and no longer."

There may have been ignorance on the part of magistrates, but I cannot excuse them for that. They ought to have known the law, and I believe that in many cases they did. I cannot believe, as was stated by the noble Marquess last night and by the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill, that it was almost invariably the case that magistrates considered they had no power of suspending a licence in any case of redundancy. I have done a great deal of magisterial work but have never sat upon brewster sessions. Nevertheless, I feel confident, from all I know, that licensing magistrates must have been aware of what the law was. There was the decision in 1882 and afterwards the decision in the "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" case, which distinctly bore out the view that my noble and learned friend Lord Davey laid before your Lordships. Therefore, there was no excuse for magistrates contending that they did not know the law. But what has happened? This enormous sum of money to which I have referred—over £91,000,000—which has been invested in brewery shares, has all been invested since the decision in the "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" case was given in the year 1892.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The licences themselves were in existence before that.

*EARL SPENCER: I am not able to dispute what the noble Marquess has just said; but these investments have been made with the knowledge of the two famous decisions often referred to. Within the first year after the decision in the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" was given, insurances of licensed houses were effected to the amount of £3,000,000, and subsequently £60,000,000 of this property has been insured. The trade admitted the law by these enormous voluntary insurances within the first year after that decision, and by the very large insurances effected since. With regard to the two schools to whom I have referred, I at once say that I do not follow either, though I confess that in my opinion the logical position of the school who consider that licences are not property is much the stronger of the two. I think it is absolutely impossible to upset that contention. At the same time I am willing to admit, for the sake of carrying out a desirable policy of reducing the number of licences, that some *solatium*, some compensation, or some indemnity, call it what you will, should be paid to those who suffer from the withdrawal of a licence.

There may be some people who made their investments in ignorance of the risks they ran, some, but not many, who have not their risk covered by insurance. The proposal in the Bill, however, I cannot approve, and I oppose it vigorously; it is a gift to the trade in perpetuity, and that, in my view, is absolutely wrong, unnecessary, and uncalled for. If a time limit were imposed full justice might be done to the publicans and the brewing industry. Why, when the law is clear and has been proved again and again and made generally known, should we say that in carrying out the law there should be payment of compensation? I fully admit that there have been difficulties owing to the feeling that magistrates have had towards those unfortunate people who had made their investments ignorantly; but is it necessary to institute a local, not a national, levy? The reduction of licences under the Bill will be inconsiderable, and it will take years to carry out the reforms which it is perfectly legitimate for magistrates to effect in a much shorter time.

The question of jurisdiction I admit to be one of extreme difficulty; but, as I understand the measure, the powers of the magistrates in brewster sessions will be gravely restricted. There is an important difference between the prerogative of decision and the power merely to make recommendations to quarter sessions. I attach great importance to the distinction, and I fear that under the new system the same care and accuracy in the investigation of local circumstances will not be secured. I do not think a case has been made for this change. I rather cavil at what has been said as to the action of small bodies of magistrates both by Lord Belper and the Marquess of Salisbury. Lord Belper has spoken of their enthusiasm for the reduction of the number of public-houses overcoming all their scruples and leading them to deprive licence-holders of their licences in a wholesale manner. I cannot believe that this is accurate; and I think that when the noble Marquess suggested a danger of suppression of licences on account of the prevalence of eccentric views in a locality, a slur was cast on the magistrates which they do not deserve. I defy the noble Marquess to prove this danger. Have the Government investigated any case alleged to have been decided on this principle by an eccentric bench of magistrates? The provisions of the Bill as to the powers of the magistrates are exceedingly complicated. Already the difficulties of the magistrates in the administration of the licensing law are enormous, but this Bill, it seems to me, will increase them tenfold. In fact, I have heard in the country that lawyers are chuckling over the Bill, because they think an enormous harvest will be reaped by them out of the complications of this measure when it becomes law.

If the Bill is to remain in the form in which it left the other House, I would infinitely prefer that it should be thrown out than it should pass, because it would set back the current of temperance reform; but my views would be entirely changed if there could be a time limit inserted in the measure. The time limit would overcome the difficulty on which I have dwelt as to the permanency given to the licence. I differ from the view that the time limit would only postpone the problem, and that it would arise again at the end of the period for which the time limit was imposed. After the speech of Lord Davey there can be no doubt that the licence-holders can then protect themselves adequately by insurance.

I support and urge the acceptance of the time limit on the Government as the only thing which will make the Bill a real measure of licensing reform. I cannot help remarking on the way in which the Bill has come up to your Lordships' House. It has come up after being closured in the other House to an enormous extent; in fact, four-fifths of the Bill have not been discussed at all, and even the Government Amendments have not been debated. Is it right that a Bill of this gigantic importance should be brought to your Lordships at a time when it is almost impossible for us to deal with it?

In conclusion, I appeal to your Lordships most earnestly to deal broadly with the measure. There have been occasions when this House has been hailed as the saviour of the country when it has refused to pass measures which have come up even with large majorities. I wish I could appeal to the House to consider this question, not as one of Party, but as one of national importance, for all religious and representative bodies feel deeply that the great evil of drink ought to be dealt with; but, instead of promoting temperance this Bill will only increase the power of the brewers and will aggravate the drink evil. I appeal to your Lordships to rise to the occasion and to consider the enormous importance of settling a difficulty which has been agitating the country so long. I hope you will put away the consideration that this must be treated as a measure belonging to the Government and pass a measure with a time limit, and so settle at last a question of such vast importance to the country.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I never rise to reply to the noble Earl who has just sat down without wishing that he were on our side, because his candour and moderation invariably win for what he says the favourable consideration of the House. But on this occasion his enthusiasm has led him to take up a line totally different from that which he usually adopts. For the second time in the course of the debate it has been intimated to the right rev. Prelates that it is very wrong of them to take part in political action unless they take part on the Liberal side. The noble Earl expressed his regret that the right rev. Prelates had generally shown a tendency to favour measures coming from the Conservative Party. I confess that in my mind I cannot reconcile that with a desire to get rid of Party altogether.

*EARL SPENCER: I said that there were occasions when national considerations might be higher than Party.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I myself do not think Party is a bad thing, because it is the only way in which great bodies in the country can have their political views crystallised and put into force. The noble Earl seems to assume that the question of temperance is of importance to one side only; but this Bill is recommended, rightly or wrongly, on the ground that it will promote temperance. By way of showing that the Bill ought to be rejected the noble Earl went into statistics of drunkenness and the amount of property owned by the brewers. I cannot help thinking there is gross exaggeration about all this, because when we are dealing with 40,000,000 of people the amount which they eat and drink must come out in very large figures. And why the phase "intoxicating liquors?" I remember a very distinguished man objecting to alcoholic liquors being called "intoxicating liquors," and saying one might just as sensibly call water a "drowning liquor."

What we have heard to-night is the most extraordinary jumble of approval and disapproval, now of the Bill, now of the Government, and especially of the magistrates. The noble Earl can hardly find words of sufficient severity in which to speak of the number of public-houses in the country; but how have they come to be so much in excess? The noble Earl knows perfectly well that not a single public-house in the country can exist without the sanction of the magistrates; yet he speaks with indignation of what he considers the interference with the independence of the magistrates. You cannot have it both ways. If noble Lords have such confidence in the magistrates, why do they want the system altered at all? The question raised last night by my noble and learned friend Lord Davey was a question of a technicality as distinguished from the substance of the matter. Nobody doubts that the licence is granted for a single year, but by way of analogy I could give many cases in which the common sense of mankind has gone beyond the mere words or letter of a document. For instance, how many farms in the country are held from year to year? Yet the same farms are often held by father and son and grandson in succession. It was the intention of the Legislature that a licence should continue as a rule. One of the learned Judges in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" said—

> "I am convinced that the Legislature intended that, as a rule, the licence should be continued."

And that is all that my noble friend who introduced the Bill has said. I am old enough to remember the time when it was the ordinary practice that the licence should be renewed unless there was something against the licensee. A man would not go into a public-house and provide proper accommodation for the public, as to which magistrates were always very particular, unless he had a good expectation that his licence would be renewed. It was not the ordinary course of things that the accommodation of the public should come to an end at the end of one year, always supposing that there was no misconduct, or nothing inappropriate with public convenience and usefulness. It was for the use of the public, not the publican, that a house was continued in the same place and under the same circumstances, and to suggest that, entirely apart from all change of circumstance, it should be at the caprice of any particular Court seems to me to be absolutely absurd. My noble and learned friend Lord Davey has quoted the Act which says that a licence shall last for one year and no longer, but I cannot help thinking that my noble friend wanted to add the words "and shall not be renewed." No one in common sense can suppose that any one would invest any amount of money in a house if the licence was to be taken away at the end of the year, out of deference to my noble friend I will not say at the caprice, but at the mere will of a Court without any reason guiding them. It is against that principle that one protests. The decision in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" established what I should have thought did not require much to establish, the fact there was no legal right to the continuance of the licence, and nobody in his senses, I think, has ever contended that there was such a right. But the question is whether or not there should be the power of taking away licences under certain circumstances. An agitation has grown up in the country, and magistrates take one side or another; their functions have been so well discharged, and the confidence of the country in their administration is so great, that I deeply regret that magistrates should have allowed themselves to be made the vehicles of an agitation.

It is said that the existence of public-houses is necessarily accompanied by drunkenness. I noted, however, that the noble Earl, with that fairness which always distinguishes him, said there was a school which considered that there was no relation between the number of public-houses and the amount of drunkenness; and to suggest that people with this unfortunate tendency to drink will not get drink because there are only two public-houses in a place where there used to be three or four, is, to my mind, an absolute delusion. People with that tendency will get drink somewhere or other if they can. I remember that after the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill was passed a whole troop of people—but for the presence of the rev. Bench I was going to say a congregation – used to walk about three miles, from Cardiff into Monmouthshire, in order to get drink on Sunday. But assuming the relation between the number of public-houses and the amount of drunkenness, this Bill wishes to try the experiment of reduction, which, it is alleged, will be a satisfactory aid to temperance. But it lays down also that regard should be had to what people have invested in the trade, which is a lawful one.

One would suppose really, to hear the talk on the subject, that there was something wicked in being a brewer or publican. That is not the line taken by Lord Grey, who, I am happy to observe, is of opinion that a well-conducted public-house can be a source of comfort, and even sometimes of intellectual enjoyment in a village. We must recognise that there are classes of the community whose life in the country would be very dull unless they could indulge in social intercourse. Referring, lastly, to the complaint that the Bill has not been sufficiently discussed, it is true that the whole of it has not been discussed, but a great deal of it has been over-discussed. The question is whether speeches have not been made over and over again, not to elucidate the facts or establish propositions, but to talk the Bill out. I rather think I have, in the past, listened to the noble Earl introducing a Bill, the discussion of which had also been limited, which was not for the purpose of regulating the liquor traffic, but of disintegrating the Empire. I confess I lament very much the use of the particular system known as the guillotine, but I think the unhappy necessity for it would not have arisen if the Bill had been properly and reasonably discussed.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON: My Lords, after the many touching appeals which have been made to the Episcopal Bench, it is fitting, perhaps, that one occupant at any rate of that Bench should respond to the appeal. Let me say that, whether it comes from one side of the House or the other, we feel it an honour that such an appeal should be made to us. I hope it places upon us a sense of the great responsibility which we have by our presence in this House, and I cordially welcome what was said by the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, that we who sit on the Episcopal Bench should be above Party considerations in everything that we do in this House. If I may take an illustration from my experience in the past, I may say that I have had for many years charge of an institution called the Oxford House, in Bethnal Green. I have had Members from both sides of this House and their relatives and friends to help me in the work, and I found at one time the greatest difficulty in keeping the belief of the district in the impartiality of the work of that house. I had to help me some distinguished relatives of the noble Marquess on this side of the House, and I found the greatest difficulty in making the people believe that anyone of the name of Cecil could be associated with anything but a Party organisation. Fortunately, I also got at my side some relatives of noble Lords on the other side of the House, and I played off one against the other, and at last succeeded in convincing the district that we were a non-political organisation. As I look back on those years it is with satisfaction that I find that honours were easy.

Now, as tribunes of the people, which I claim we ought to be in this House, I look upon it as a happy thing that this Bench should be associated at one time with one side of the House and at another with the other side. In regard to the present Bill some of us see eye to eye more with those who are on the opposite side of the House than with those on the Government side, at any rate on one important point. Let me say at once that there is no ignoble rivalry between us and the Nonconformists on the temperance question. I grasp at the temperance platform as the platform on which we can all meet, and some of the happiest recollections of my life in London are temperance meetings with Nonconformists all round me on a platform listening to the eloquence of Mrs. Bramwell Booth. Therefore, I come to the consideration of this Bill with more than an open mind. It is spoken of as a temperance Bill. I clutch, as a temperance reformer, at a temperance Bill. It comes from some of my dear personal friends, and it comes, too, from a quarter where much personal service and much help have been given in the past. I therefore take it up with every desire to really give a most thorough consideration to its provisions, and all the more so when I am promised by the Colonial Secretary in another place that 25 per cent. of the public-houses in London will be reduced, perhaps in one year, by the Bill.

I turn to it, but on examination of the provisions I must say I am wofully disappointed, for I find that this promised boon of 25 per cent. means the assignment of all the levies in London for a period of 48 years. All further reform during the 48 years is therefore stopped, and a full vested interest in the remaining licences is created. I find, further, that between March, 1890, and March, 1903, 552 on-licences were suppressed in London, and that if progress were made at the same rate there would be, at the end of the 48 years, without any Bill, a reduction of 2,038 licences, whereas, under the operations of the Bill, the utmost would be 1,855 reductions. If that is the case in London, as Bishop of London and a temperance reformer I am wofully disappointed. Then I turn to see whether in the country there will be any greater reductions under the Bill than is at present going on. I have figures in my hand which show that there have been 24 licences refused at brewster sessions in 1903 in Liverpool. The reduction under the Bill would be 18. In Manchester 40 were refused. Under the Bill the reduction would be 17. In Exeter 13, under the Bill 2; in Canterbury 9, under the Bill 2; in Swansea 16 under the Bill 5. It is the same in the counties. I find that in Cumberland there have been 23, under the Bill there would be 16. In Anglesey 19, under the Bill 2; in Carnarvon 19, under the Bill 2; in Merionethshire 12, under the Bill 2.

If those who bring in this Bill wish to commend it to temperance reformers they must show that there will be more reductions under the Bill than if there was no Bill. If there were no objections to the Bill, if it came before us without any evils in its train, it would not attract me because of the little good it would seem to do. My experience in East London taught me that the real secret of temperance reform was not the denouncing of publicans and brewers, but the provision of counter-attractions. The counter-attractions drew away men and boys from the public-houses, and I could point to hundreds of young, sober, self-respecting citizens of twenty-five years of age, whom I have known from boys of fifteen, simply through the counter-attractions in boys' clubs and men's clubs. But now that our money from voluntary sources is spent in providing counter-attractions, we have looked with the greatest hope to my friend Lord Grey's scheme, and I was astonished to hear him bless the Bill in the way he did.

I myself, looking at it from the same point of view, and anxious to bring about the same result, cannot take anything like the optimistic view of the Bill that Earl Grey does. I endeavoured on a small scale to do in Bethnal Green what the noble Earl has done on a large scale. Finding a licence was to be given up, I asked the owner if he would let me have it. I wanted it as a counter-attraction, and I offered £10,000, hoping to raise the money somehow. The good lady most kindly said, "I think I shall get a little more than that for it;" and she sold it for £50,000 the next day. I do not know how long the purse of my noble friend Lord Grey is, but my purse and the purses of my friends are absolutely unable to cope with such a vast expenditure as that. When we look further we find that, under the Bill, we are really to pay on the inflated value caused by excessive competition. I do not find in the Bill any caution with regard to inflated prices. We have all heard stories of a man walking in, getting his licence, and being offered £15,000 or £18,000 the next day, and going out. The very action of the Bill in shutting up some public-houses will obviously increase the value of those that are left, and therefore we shall be hampered in our work at every point unless the Bill is amended in this most important particular.

Then comes the question, Can the trade really afford to pay more? Is it true that the trade is in such a suffering condition that it cannot pay more from its money value for the good of the people? I look to see what has been done in America. I find that the average licence duty in Massachusetts is £346—nine times the charge in London. The total revenue in England and Wales is £1,430,000, less by half-a-million than that of New York alone. In London it is about £275,000. If the levy was made on the New York scale we should have £2,600,000 to play with in London. When I turn to individual firms of brewers and distillers I find statements like the following, which was made at the annual meeting of the firm of John Dewar & Sons, Limited—

> "The Chairman, in moving the adoption of the report, said the profits of the company had made steady progress, and last year was the best in the history of the company. The profits were £104,720, and the prospect for the future was very bright. The directors recommended 20 per cent. dividend, and the payment of a large sum to reserve."

Therefore, I feel we have an unexploited value, as it were, under our feet in London alone which ought to be of immense value, without the hampering restrictions in the Bill of temperance reform in the future.

Then, again, I am quite unreconciled, in spite of the speech of the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack, to the dismissal from their duties of the local authorities as the licensing magistrates. I was very much impressed by what fell from the noble Viscount opposite when he asked where the motive power was to come from for the machinery in the Bill. What is it that we can appeal to most readily? It is local patriotism, local interest, the desire to make one's borough a healthier and more sober place. You cut at local patriotism if you take away from the licensing authority of the district their powers of discipline. I find that, out of 627 licences that were refused by the magistrates, 477 were not appealed against at all. Yet we are told that under the Bill the same system that we have had before will practically obtain. The licensing magistrates in these cases had actual power, which they used for the good of the public. I could not follow the figures given by the noble Marquess the Marquess of Salisbury. He mentioned 220 licences as all that had been suppressed during a certain period. But, if this is so, surely the case against the magistrates of using their powers in a most arbitrary way falls to the ground.

Now I come to my last point—the time limit. Three things are said about the time limit. It is said (1) that you might as well talk about a time limit to the Eighth Commandment; (2) that we shall be in the same position at the end of the fourteen years, if that were made the time limit; and (3) that it is inconsistent with the rest of the Bill. Let me take these one by one. If it was really true that it was equivalent to putting a time limit on the Eighth Commandment, I am sure that not one of your Lordships, and certainly not one member of the Episcopal Bench would advocate it. I am not going to enter into the legal controversy between the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack and Lord Davey as to the equity of the claim of the licence-holder to compensation. All I can say is that the proposal in the Amendment to be moved by the most rev. Primate—namely, that there should be a fourteen years time limit, and then a licence given for seven years—is a most generous concession to that equitable claim to consideration which has been raised by the practice of the magistrates in the past. I cannot altogether agree that the real facts of the case were so entirely unknown as represented, for I find that, in the year 1883, there was a letter in the *Morning Advertiser* written by a Mr. Nash, in which he says—

> "A still more unfortunate result of this case is that it has promulgated and divulged what had been more or less a professional secret, namely, that subject to an appeal, magistrates can refuse to renew a licence."

I am not pressing that as against the proposal of the most rev. Primate; I am only showing that you can push the theory that everybody was misled too far. In the most rev. Primate's Amendment you are really giving a very valuable *quid pro quo* to the trade. You are giving them security for so many years and the elimination of competitors and trade rivals during the period, and if you give them, in addition, a seven years licence when that is over, I cannot see the injustice of the proposal at all. It is said you will be in the same position at the end of the fourteen years. Not at all. There is all the difference in the world between a certain equitable claim which is recognised, satisfied, and extinguished and one which is not.

Then, again, is a time limit inconsistent with the Bill? My own belief is that it will be in line with the Bill. The dual system of licences established by the Bill will produce confusion in the country; but under such a scheme as proposed by the most rev. Primate you would have a unity and a continuity which everyone could understand. I plead, then, very earnestly for freedom. It may be asked, Why, if these considerations are true, give such generous terms? Why give a fourteen years time limit and then a seven years licence? Forgive a Bishop for reminding you of a Scriptural illustration. There was a man who first served seven years and then another seven years for the fair Rachael he wished to wed; but he got her at last. We are content first to serve seven years and then another seven years, and to go one better and do seven years more in order to recover freedom. But freedom we must have at last.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I rise with some diffidence to follow the very interesting speech made by the right rev. Prelate, than whom no man, either in your Lordships' House or outside of it, has devoted himself more unremittingly to the interests of the poorer classes of this city. The right rev. Prelate told your Lordships in the first place that he believed there was in this country a huge unexploited value in licences and in the manufactures turned out by distillers and brewers. My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer turned every way, when framing his Budget, to find some additional sources of revenue, and when he came to consider whether beer and spirits would bear additional taxation the returns of the consumption were such that he was obliged to abandon it. I do not think that is a proof that there is the large unexploited value to which the right rev. Prelate referred. Then the right rev. Prelate brought forward the case of a large number of licences, the refusal to renew which was not, he said, appealed against May it not have been that those licences were of no value, or of very little value? and in those cases in which a licence of little or no value is withdrawn, very little, if any, compensation will be paid.

But what your Lordships are asked by the noble Viscount opposite to do is to refuse to give a Second Reading to the Bill, and instead thereof to say that the House cannot accept as a satisfactory settlement of the licensing question a Bill which creates a perpetual interest in a terminable licence. I think I rather understood the most rev. Primate in his speech yesterday to say that if the Government denied that that was the effect of the Bill they might very well accept the Amendment. I am not sure that the most rev. Primate was not right, especially if the noble Viscount the mover of the Amendment would consent to the addition of certain words to his Motion, to the effect that this House welcomes a Bill which will quickly terminate many unnecessary licences in some of which a perpetual interest now exists. What are the obstacles to a reduction in the number of licences? In the first place magistrates are powerless to deal with the ante-1869 beer houses; and, in the second place, although the magistrates have the power they have not the will to abolish licences without compensation. The power of the justices has not been in any way questioned. They can refuse to renew licences, subject, of course, to those judicial qualifications referred to by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. But I think it will be plain to your Lordships that the general opinion of the magistrates throughout the country is averse to doing what they believe would work an injustice. There is proof of that in the particular town where the magistrates have been most active in refusing to renew licences—I mean in Birmingham. What has happened there? The general body of the magistrates in Birmingham have turned out the licensing committee of the borough with Mr. Arthur Chamberlain at the head of it. I think nothing could be more conclusive than that the general opinion of magistrates is that it is unfair and unjust to refuse to renew licences in the case of houses which have been well conducted.

What we are really suffering from is vacillation in legislation and in administration. Parliament has taken different views at different times. In 1830 they thought they ought to encourage the sale of beer rather than the sale of spirits, and so everybody was allowed to take out beer licences. In 1869 they thought it was better to encourage the sale of beer for consumption off the premises than on the premises, and it was proposed to give privileges to off-licences. Then it was thought that this was an injustice to existing on-licences. The privileges of the beerhouses in existence before 1869 were therefore preserved. The problem we have before us is to devise a scheme of social reform with a fair measure of justice to the brewer and the publican, and I maintain that the Bill now before the House is of such a character. It is little more than a declaratory measure. It announces to the trade that Parliament intends to have a reduction in the number of licences, and calls upon the trade itself to make provision against the loss that individuals may suffer. The only question I think which arises is, "Will the reduction be sufficient to meet the necessities of the case?"

The right rev. Prelate who has just sat down told us of a number of places where he believed the money arising from the levy would be insufficient, and he included London among them. The right rev. Prelate is no doubt well acquainted with the conditions which obtain in London, but I have seen a very careful estimate made by a body for which I have great respect, and for which I think other noble Lords who are members of it cannot fail to have equal respect—I refer to the London County Council. That council has a department of trained statistical officers, and I think it is not unreasonable to take the statistics which are prepared by that body as having been collected with care, and as being probably accurate. The London County Council estimate that the produce of this levy will be £190,000, and that that will enable them to give compensation for public-houses of the character which have been expropriated by them at the rate of sixty-three per annum. They estimate the average value of those public-houses at £3,000. I think that is a very high estimate; it may be very much lower; it will certainly be considerably lower in the country, because it is based upon the public-houses which have been acquired by the London County Council in the course of their improvements in different parts of London, including thoroughfares where the property is of very great value, such as Northumberland Avenue and the new street between Holborn and the Strand. If the London County Council are able to extinguish sixty-three of these licences per annum, I think the Bill will give no small measure of protection to the people of London.

There is another point. The noble Viscount, in the Minority Report, expressed the opinion that the maximum number of public-houses should be one to 750 of the population. Well, my Lords, if this Bill passes into law, the London County Council estimate that the total number of redundant licences that they will be able to get rid of will be 1,575; but on the basis of one to 750 of the population it would only be necessary to get rid of 1,150. With regard to other towns in the country, if you take the average value of a public-house at £1,000, you will be able to reduce the number by over 1,000 in the first year, and to abolish a large number every year while the fund remains in operation. The noble Viscount who spoke last night waxed very eloquent over what he called the "rotten little beerhouses." He said they had no value now, but that if the Bill passed they would be entitled to compensation. I hope that, in my reply to the right rev. Prelate, I have shown to your Lordships that if a public-house is about to die of inanition it must be worthless and entitled to no compensation, or, at any rate, to very little compensation.

It is said that this Bill has been introduced in the interests of the brewer and of the publican. If we had had that intention we might have brought in a Bill to suspend for a time the power of the magistrates to refuse renewals, or to apply to on-licences the conditions which attach to beerhouse licences. A friend of mine, speaking to me at the beginning of the session on this subject, said, "I suppose your Government is going to bring in a Bill to reverse the decision in the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield"? I replied that we thought the proper course was to provide for the extinction of licences by a fund to be furnished by the trade themselves. He said, "You will never do that, because the brewers will not let you; and if you did you would destroy one of the best planks in the Radical programme." I do not know what has been the effect on the Radical programme; but I do know that the noble Earl who sits on the Cross Benches, Lord Rosebery, was persistent in the early years of the present Government in saying that we had wasted our time and neglected to deal either with education or with the temperance question. We have dealt with one, and we are dealing with the other. I do not think, judging from the cheers I hear on the opposite side, that we are likely to get much assistance from noble Lords opposite.

This is not the first time that we have endeavoured to deal with the temperance question. In 1888 we introduced a Bill which would have provided a large sum towards the reduction of licences; in 1890 we brought in a Budget Resolution which would have provided £400,000 for the purposes of the extinction of licences. Both of these proposals were opposed by the friends of noble Lords opposite and I sincerely hope, now that we are prepared to deal with this question on the basis of a sum of no less than £1,200,000, that they will not be successful in preventing our carrying these intentions into effect.

I should like to say a few words with reference to the criticisms that were passed on the Bill in the very able and, I think, temperate speech of the noble Viscount who moved the Amendment. In the first place, he took exception to the fact that a very large part of the Bill as it comes before your Lordships' House consists of Amendments introduced by His Majesty's Government in another place, and which were not, of course, in the Bill when it was originally submitted to the House of Commons. I join with the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack in regretting the conditions under which this Bill was got through the House of Commons; but I think the noble Viscount, who has had a long experience of that House, will be fully aware of what takes place there in the course of the passage of an important Government measure. Amendments are put down and suggestions made, and the Government embody many of them in the Bill. That is precisely what happened in the case of this Bill. The Amendments may not have been discussed but they were put on the Paper, and wherever they seemed reasonable the Government, being most anxious to meet, as far as possible, the objections of all those interested in the question, accepted them, and we feel that the Bill has been thereby materially improved.

Then the noble Viscount complained that the Bill blocks all future reform, but I notice he was careful to say "so far as the Bill can do so." Yes, my Lords, the Bill can do very little, if anything, in that direction. What it does is to provide a compulsory insurance fund to give an indemnity to those whose licences have to be surrendered, but it in no way prevents any measure of temperance reform that may be brought in by noble Lords opposite to-morrow or twenty years hence from being carried, and there can be no reason if Parliament decides that the rest of the public-houses shall be expropriated and handed over to the municipal authorities—there is nothing in this Bill that will prevent that being done. The noble Viscount complained that the Bill took away the disciplinary functions of the brewster sessions. If the noble Lord means that it will take away from the magistrates the power of saying, "If you will not surrender your licence without compensation we will soon make you," I am quite willing to admit to that extent it does take away some of their disciplinary powers. But if he says it takes away from the magistrates the power to make the licence-holder improve his premises for the proper conduct of his business then I say there is not a word in the Bill to prevent the justices ordering such structural alterations as they were able to order under the Act of 1892. These powers remain in this Bill as they did in that, and the magistrates at brewster sessions will be able to call on a licence-holder to make the necessary structural alterations, and, if he does not do so, that is one of the reasons upon which a licence may be refused. The most rev. Primate, I was glad to hear, gave expression to the opinion that the most desirable alteration that could possibly be brought about now would be the better management of public-houses, more careful tenants, and the doing away with those tricks and dodges which it is sometimes necessary for the lower class of publicans to resort to in order to attract custom. We believe that is one of the many things this Bill will accomplish. It will get rid of the houses which are most difficult of supervision, and leave only those which will not find it necessary to pursue those tricks and dodges which the most rev. Primate deplores. I also welcome his suggestion that in every case justice should be meted out to the individual, and the most rev. Primate went on to say—

> "Can we not consistently, while doing justice to the individual, do something to prevent the monopoly which the State has given to licence-holders lasting for ever?"

I do not think short of compensation for expropriation that it is possible for the State to ask a man to give up that which the State has, perhaps misguidedly, once given to him. But I think the most rev. Primate is looking rather far ahead when he suggests that at the end of fourteen or twenty-one years you should do something by this Bill that should put an end to all the houses in existence, or at any rate take away the prospect of the renewal of the licences. The time may come when your Lordships or the other House of Parliament may be prepared to do something in that direction, but it is rather far ahead of to-day, and it is rather a sanguine thing to expect a proposal of this kind to be made in the Bill of 1904.

The noble Earl opposite who opened the debate this afternoon spoke in feeling terms and in language in no way too strong of the serious results of the too free indulgence in intoxicating liquor, and he threw some doubt on the proposal of the Government as to whether it would do anything to diminish that evil by the diminution of licences. I do not understand the noble Lord to say that the diminution of licences would produce a diminution in the consumption of drink. That is a matter open to some argument, but if the contention is right that these houses provide a temptation which, if they did not exist, men would not fall a prey to—if there is any truth in that argument, then it is patent that the diminution of licences must result in diminution of drunkenness. The noble Earl laid great stress on the amount of capital which he said had been invested in distilleries, and in breweries, since the decision in the House of Lords in the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield," and he endeavoured to argue from that that the owners of licences must have been perfectly well aware of the precarious tenure of this property.

*Earl SPENCER: I said the licensee so far as I knew. I do not attempt to contradict the noble Marquess's statement; it was the investments in the brewery companies that I alluded to.

The Earl of ONSLOW: But that is only a change in property—property held by one class of people and transferred to another. I believe there has for the most part been a change from absolute owners to limited liability companies, and it might be that in some limited liability company some of the owners of public-house property saw a possible way of escape from the position brought about by the decision in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield." The noble Lord then took exception to a statement of my noble friend behind me, who said that a licence in its ordinary condition had an element of property, in that licences were assessed for the death duties—the noble Lord said they were assessed at their actual value. Does the noble Lord really imagine that under this Bill something more will be given than their actual value. If he will look at the Bill he will find that nothing is to be given in excess of value.

*Earl SPENCER: But it increases the value greatly.

The Earl of ONSLOW: How does it increase the value? If you insure against it the insurance goes out of your pocket, and it does not increase the value because you have already paid for it. I could understand that, if the allegation that the Bill was going to turn something not freehold into freehold had any foundation in fact, there might be something in the argument, but nobody will contend any such thing. At the very best these licences are liable to be withdrawn for misconduct. What would your Lordships' estates be worth under similar conditions. Would they be worth what they are now, if they were liable to be withdrawn on the ground of your misconduct. It might be that some of your Lordships' estates might be liable to pass into other hands. Then his Lordship says, "Why do you ask owners of licensed property to make this compulsory insurance when it is possible for them to do it voluntarily?" Unless I am misinformed there are some risks that can be insured against and other risks that cannot, and I am told that, in those districts where the magistrates have been active in refusing renewals, the licence has become absolutely uninsurable. No doubt the loss of a licence through misconduct on the part of the licensee is a risk that can be insured against, and is insured against every day, but there are other risks that will not be received, and I believe that where it is the practice to refuse renewals on the ground of redundancy it would be impossible to insure that risk. The Bill is a simple one and makes very few changes in existing law. So far as renewals are concerned, I think it improves, rather than otherwise, the position of the brewster sessions, the Court of First Instance. I have explained how this matter stands now. The brewster sessions consider the renewal of the licences and may express an opinion that the renewal is not desirable. On this an appeal lies to quarter sessions.

*EARL SPENCER: It does not express an opinion now. It decides whether a licence shall be renewed or not.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: Subject to an appeal to quarter sessions, where the brewster magistrates appear, in my opinion, in the somewhat degraded position of respondents to the case. They have to make their case good before it is upheld. What will occur under this Bill? They will consider the licences in their district and decide on those which they think ought not to be renewed on the ground of redundancy; they will make their report and will confer with the Court of quarter sessions, and will give their reasons why, in their opinion, certain licences should not be renewed. It is absolutely necessary that those should be considered by quarter sessions because they have the administration of the fund, and whatever may be the opinion of the magistrates in brewster sessions, they cannot refuse more licences than they are able to compensate. It must be in the jurisdiction of quarter sessions to decide how far the money in their hands will go. There is no new title created by this Bill, and no greater interest than exists at present. The initiative still remains with the brewster magistrates, and I venture to say these matters will be carried out with more justice under this Bill than under the existing law.

There is another set of cases where the licence is refused on the ground of misconduct on the part of the licence-holder. There is no change in those cases whatever; those cases will be investigated by the magistrates and an application will lie at quarter sessions, just as now, sitting as a Court of criminal law. After that there are provisions in the Bill, which have been little dealt with either this evening or last night, but of great importance to temperance reform. There is the clause which deals with the question of the granting of new licences. Under that clause we hope we shall prevent for ever the growing up of that monopoly value which in many parts of the House has been deplored. There is nothing in the clause to prevent the magistrates granting licences to corporations such as that with which my noble friend Lord Grey is connected; they may be granted without pecuniary conditions provided they create no monopoly value for those who hold the licence. We are not, after all, arguing this question as if it was possible to ask a person to do without intoxicants altogether. Some of us believe that there is no such thing as a thirsty soul, but no one can suggest that a working man returning from work, or a cyclist, or a pedestrian is tempted into drunkenness because he comes upon a public-house, but rather that he goes in to assuage his thirst. This country will have the same convenience it has enjoyed in the past, to purchase beer as it has to purchase beef or boots. I do not claim for this measure that it is an heroic measure; it is certainly not the revolutionary change which the noble Viscount shadowed forth. He opposes the Bill; he would continue the justices reluctant to refuse renewals; he would leave the ante-1869 beerhouses in the unsatisfactory condition in which they they are now; he thinks the £1,200,000 for the extinction of licences not worth having, but five years have passed since his Report, and he has not introduced any measure into this House, and now he asks your Lordships to reject this measure and wait for something quite different. Like the noble Earl, I also would appeal to the right rev. Bench, but on different grounds. The noble Viscount appealed to them not to be behind their Nonconformist brethren in their demand for temperance reform. I think amongst those most anxious to get rid of this Bill there are to be enumerated a great many Nonconformist congregations who appeal to the right rev. Bench as representing the Church and as common-sense Englishmen knowing what Englishmen want. I think there is no man more gifted in common sense than the most rev. Primate who spoke last night. We ask them now whether it is worth while to risk this Bill in the hope that some day they may get something different. This Bill is brought before this House by the Government, after having passed the other House; it takes a long step in the direction of diminishing the excessive number of licences which the law has regrettably allowed to grow up, and I believe if your Lordships pass this Bill you will be able to effect a large reduction in the number of licences without associating with it any act of injustice which would be repulsive to all noble Members of this House.

LORD BURGHCLERE: I have listened with all due respect to the speech of the noble Earl who has just sat down, and I observed at its conclusion the noble Earl made an impassioned appeal to the right rev. Bench. He was not alone in that appeal to the right rev. Bench, the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal also sought for the suffrage of the right rev. Prelates, and, moreover, he tried to minimise the effection the eloquent speech of the noble Viscount who introduced this Amendment. He pointed to the noble Viscount and his references to the Episcopal Bench, when he said it was thought that the Nonconformists, either rightly or wrongly, had taken a more vigorous interest in the cause of temperance than the Established Church. The noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal pointed out that this was a dangerous temptation, and called upon the right rev. Bench to beware of the snares of the tempter, and then the Lord Privy Seal turned round with an almost minatory glance to the right rev. Bench, and warned them lest they should be provoked into voting against this measure in conformity with their Nonconformist brothers. I could not help remembering that the last time, on a former occasion in our history, when the Bishops were in accord with the Nonconformists, the Government of the day placed seven of them in the dock, with the thoroughgoing consent of the Lord Privy Seal of that time.

The noble Earl who has just sat down has told us one of the advantages of the measure will be that it will get rid of many of those undesirable houses which it is now so difficult to get rid of. I would ask him in what clause or what section this very desirable element is to be found. I rather fancy myself that the noble Earl will find it has precisely the opposite effect. Then the noble Lord went on to state that this measure was a mere declaratory measure. It declared to the world that Parliament intended to get rid of superfluous and redundant licences. Now I should like to say a word or two about that, but before I come to that part of the matter I would remind the noble Earl that though he discussed this Bill for some time with his usual lucidity and ability, the main object which we are debating at the moment, the question of a time limit, found a very small place in the remarks which he addressed to the House.

LORD ONSLOW: That will be left to the Committee.

LORD BURGHCLERE: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. The Motion moved by the noble Lord, Lord Peel, raises that question, and if the noble Earl was addressing the House in opposition to the Motion he should have addressed some of his remarks to the question of a time limit. But the noble Earl failed to prove, as some other speakers failed to prove, two things absolutely necessary to this measure. If it is, as the Government claim for it, to be a beneficial working measure, the noble Earl ought first to have proved that it is a measure of temperance reform. In the second place, I think he ought to have proved that this measure will consolidate and simplify the authority and administration of the present Licensing Acts. The noble Earl will remember that, at any rate, there was a unanimous Report on this from the Royal Commission appointed some time ago. If the Bill is to be a temperance measure, as the Prime Minister has stated it is, I think all of those who have studied the temperance subject would say that there should be three primary objects to be attained by this measure. There were many others, no doubt, which might be put forward, but I mention three, because the three objects I am about to mention are not enacted by this Bill, but are actually legislated against. The three necessary objects to be attained by this Bill, if it is to be a temperance measure, are first of all that it should appreciably reduce the number of redundant and superfluous public-houses; secondly, that it should not create vested interests in annual licences; and thirdly, that it should, as far as possible, lead to the withholding or granting of licences at the option of the locality in which those licences are going to be employed.

With regard to the reduction of licences I think many speakers, certainly in another place, and many noble Lords who have spoken here now, would claim that this Bill will reduce a considerable number of superfluous licences. I venture to traverse that statement altogether. I venture to assert that this Bill will not reduce any considerable number of superfluous licences in the future, and I shall venture to show, if your Lordships will allow me, that it will not only not appreciably reduce the number of redundant licences, but, in my opinion, will call into being licences which at the present moment are dormant. This Bill is to reduce the number of redundant licences, and I think the noble Earl himself claimed that one of the means by which it would do so was by the transference of the functions from brewster sessions to quarter sessions. I think exactly the contrary. I have the highest respect for the Court of quarter sessions, but when you are going to give the sole responsibility to quarter sessions I think it is only right that we should see how they have treated appeals to them with regard to licences in the past. In 1903 there were 220 licences refused by the brewster sessions on the ground of non-requirement. In 112 cases there was an appeal to quarter sessions, with the result that quarter sessions allowed 61, or more than half of those licences to be granted after all. Your Lordships will see that out of 220 cases in which the brewster sessions did not renew, there were only 112 appeals. But in the future the whole 220 will appeal, and as the quarter sessions allowed 61 of those appeals which were brought before them in the past, so, in the future, they will allow 120. I think it is a very fair presumption that quarter sessions will be a far more lenient tribunal with regard to the renewal of redundant licences, and I do not see how the transference to quarter sessions is going to reduce the number of public-houses.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: Does the noble Lord include in the numbers he has given those licences not allowed on the ground of misconduct, as well as those not allowed on the ground of redundancy?

LORD BURGHCLERE: I have told your Lordship that those were all appeals from refusals on the ground of redundancy and I think I have proved beyond dispute that quarter sessions will be a great deal more lenient in these matters than brewster sessions have been in the past. But under this Bill quarter sessions is going to be supreme in this matter. As I understand, quarter sessions can put the Bill into operation at once or need not put it into operation. If I am wrong the noble Lord will correct me, but my impression is that quarter sessions need not report the fund to the Inland Revenue Office. [The Earl of ONSLOW expressed dissent.] I think the noble Earl will find that it is as I say, but I will not pursue that argument, if it is denied officially on the Government Benches, but I hope it will be explained afterwards in this debate what the various clauses to which I refer mean. It is quite clear, as I read the Bill, that it is open to the magistrates in quarter sessions to say whether this Bill shall be put into operation or not. If that contention be true, what would you do if you had a recalcitrant quarter sessions, which did not want to have a compensation fund, and did not want to do away with redundant licences? I might point out in connection with other measures passed during this and other sessions, that there have been recalcitrant bodies which have prevented Acts coming into operation. I refer to the Welsh county councils; and if there were recalcitrant quarter sessions, would the noble Lord propose to bring in another coercion Bill to deal with them.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): I must object to the term "coercion Bill" with reference to this matter. There is no coercion in this question.

LORD BURGHCLERE: I apologise to the noble Marquess for using the slang of the day, and of course I will adopt the longer name with which he, as President of the Board of Education, is more familiar than I. Another way in which licences will not be reduced is quite obvious. By the limitation of the compensation fund at the disposal of quarter sessions you limit the number of houses which you can reduce. That has been said over and over again, and that is why this Bill will not, in my opinion, reduce any considerable number of superfluous houses. I come to another point on which this Bill will not reduce redundant licences. I refer to the licences that terminate voluntarily. The surrender of licences—there are many licences which terminate from year to year, and which are surrendered voluntarily by the licence-holders. In Liverpool alone, out of 394 that terminated in 1900 to 1903, 153 were surrendered voluntarily. Does the noble Earl who spoke so warmly just now conceive that in the future any of these licences will be surrendered voluntarily? By this Bill you make a property of them, and pay their holders for giving them up, and of course in the future all those licences which were surrendered voluntarily will not be surrendered, but will be kept up until there is sufficient money to compensate them.

I now come to a point which I approach with some diffidence, because it is a legal point—the licences which are dormant, and which may be called into existence for the purpose of getting the compensation your Bill is going to give. First of all, I must go into the matter of how these licences are procured from the brewster sessions. When a man wants to get a licence he goes to brewster sessions, and, if the justices please, he obtains from them what is called a justices' certificate or justices' licence, which costs only a few shillings. He takes that certificate to the Excise Office, where it is exchanged for an Excise licence, which costs a great deal of money. A practice has grown up year by year by which men take out a justices' certificate and then go to the Excise Office and take out a licence for beer only, because, perhaps, wine and spirits are not greatly called for in that part of the country where the licence operates. But it has been held by the Courts that a man who does this has a dormant interest, and the magistrates cannot refuse him if he applies for a full licence. I can tell of one stronger case than that, of a man who had one of these justices' certificates for twenty-eight years; he was living in what was practically a private house, and at the end of that twenty-eight years it occurred to him, for some reason or other, that he might turn that house into a fully-licensed house, and the Judge not only held that he had a right to have a full licence, but also held that he, having had that licence for twenty-eight years, came into the ante-1869 category. I do not say that this will be a constant practice, but there are cases like this all over the country, and I say that your Bill will not only not reduce redundant licences at the present moment, but that it will call into existence dormant licences simply for the reason of getting the compensation which this Bill gives. It will be obvious to the noble Earl that those who have these certificates have them because there is not sufficient trade in the neighbourhood for a full licence, and therefore they will be the first redundant licences to be removed. Whatever else may be claimed for this Bill I think I have proved it is very problematical whether it will bring about that reduction of licences which the noble Earl has claimed it is going to do.

Now, another point I should like to refer to is the simplification of the existing law. That is a point which your Lordships will remember was unanimously recommended by the Royal Commission which sat upon this subject some years ago, and I venture to say, unless I misread the Bill, that instead of consolidating and simplifying the existing law, this Bill multiplies the authorities and confuses the existing administration, and, moreover, and what is more difficult to understand, it will make it more difficult in the future. It leaves many matters indeterminate and unsettled, and leaves them to be settled by the *ipse dixit* of some magistrate in the future. I say it does not simplify the existing law, but, on the contrary, complicates the authorities. Now I ask your Lordships what authorities are employed under the existing law in granting new licences and renewing existing ones? Brewster sessions and the county licensing authorities. Two authorities. Now let your Lordships consider how many authorities are introduced into this Bill which is said to consolidate and simplify the existing law. There are ten There are brewster sessions, which initiates the proceedings to quarter sessions, quarter sessions itself, the committee of quarter sessions, borough sessions, which are to be brought into the Committee, an excellent improvement because it brings in local feeling, the Inland Revenue Department, the Home Office, which is to make rules, the Treasury which is also to make rules, and the county council which is to receive and administer the fund which you are going to get for new licences. There are, moreover, the appeals to the quarter session, there are separate areas which you are going to create for your own convenience, each with its separate machinery and separate service governed by these two authorities. You have imported into your Bill ten authorities, and I cannot think that that is what you would call simplification of the existing law.

Then I said it confused the administration. It mixes up the duties of the various authorities. Brewster sessions can now refuse a licence on six specific grounds; quarter sessions can now refuse a licence on the ground of non-requirement only. Quarter sessions cannot refuse upon the six grounds upon which brewster sessions can refuse; and quarter sessions cannot refuse a licence on the ground of non-requirement on their own responsibility, they must be set in motion by brewster sessions. That is not a simplification of the English law as it stands, or an easier method of carrying out the existing system of the granting or the renewal of licences. Quarter sessions has itself only the power to elect a committee, a mysterious committee of which we do not know the meaning at the present time, because we do not know whether it will sit as a Court or as an administrative body.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: It will take the place of the licensing committee.

LORD BURGHCLERE: If it is to take the place of the licensing committee, may I ask the noble Lord why its rules are to be regulated by the Home Office and the Treasury? The present licensing committee have no rules laid down for them by the Home Office or Treasury. The noble Earl dismisses in an airy manner this committee, as a licensing committee, but the present licensing committee is not governed by rules of a Secretary of State—it is governed by rules laid down by quarter sessions, if I am not mistaken. Therefore I cannot see the analogy which the noble Earl has just put before us.

Then, my Lords, we come to the method of raising the compensation fund, which is the pith and centre of this Bill, and to the paying of the compensation and the dividing of the spoils—I mean the shares of the compensation among the persons interested. Here, I venture to think, we shall find this Bill which your Lordships are told is so simple and so easy becomes confusion worse confounded. Take the compensation fund itself. That is to be collected by local Excise officers; it is to be sent up to London to the Inland Revenue Department. When in London the Inland Revenue Department is to set up a separate account for each quarter sessions all over the country. They then have to send this money back from London to quarter sessions and quarter sessions has to keep a separate account of money sent down to it. If ever there was a complicated system of keeping accounts I venture to think it is imported into this Bill by the Government. But when it comes to the distribution of this fund, then the complications of this Bill become mysterious indeed. In the first place you have an agreement between the persons interested. Quarter sessions can either accept that agreement and divide the sum between these people; if it does not agree it can call in the Inland Revenue Department to arbitrate between the persons concerned. But the one thing which renders this Bill so complicated is the fact that there is no settled basis on which to pay. No one in quarter sessions can possibly decide, and unless the noble Earl can show me that there is a settled basis on which quarter sessions can pay or divide this fund I must say this is a confused and difficult matter. There is another very curious provision that I should like to call attention to. Quarter sessions, in dividing the respective shares of the compensation fund, is called on by this Bill have regard to the conduct of the licence-holder. I admit that to have regard to the conduct of a licence-holder when renewing an ordinary licence is a very good thing, but when it comes to giving him a share of the sum which this Bill declares to be legally his, I should like to know what his conduct has got to do with it, and I should like to ask further how the Court is to assess the particular share of this money which is to go to the licence-holder "having regard to his conduct." Are we to have a regular schedule or how is quarter sessions to regulate the amount by which the sum, which you yourselves enact shall be his private property, shall be reduced because he has not behaved himself in the past. It is a curious provision and I hope we shall have some explanation of it in Committee.

I am sorry to have to trouble your Lordships at such length but I think that I have shown that this Bill is not a measure of temperance reform and that it does not consolidate and simplify the existing licensing law. For my part I wish the Government would withdraw the Bill and spend their time in the recess in the pleasant holiday task of composing a Bill which would be of some permanent value. I cannot help thinking that this Bill cannot be a solution of the question of temperance if it passes in its present form. I am perfectly willing to admit that if you introduce a time limit into this Bill it will improve it and that it might be satisfactory in time to come, but I take it from what the noble Marquess stated last night that the Government are not prepared to accept any Amendment with regard to a time limit. I say that if you pass this Bill as it is you will raise great agitation in the country and you will throw the whole question of licensing and temperance into the melting-pot. My Lords, it is a curious fact that the Government, through some pursuing fate or other, has cast into that vessel many of the principal subjects that have come before them. We know from the debates we have had lately on Army organisation that the whole organisation of the Army is cast into the melting-pot; we know from what has taken place in Wales and other parts of the country that the great question of education has been cast into the melting-pot; the whole question of finance, the fiscal policy the country is to expect, is cast into the melting-pot, and unless they propose to bring in an effective measure the Government are going to throw the licensing laws into the melting-pot. In the past we have had many nicknames given to the Government and Parliament of the day. We have heard of the Parliament of the Tuns; of the Who? Who? Ministry; of the Long Parliament, and of the drunken Parliament, and I venture to think that in the future this Government will be known by the nickname of the Melting-pot Government.

Lord Burghclere.

*VISCOUNT CROSS: I believe the question of the title of the present Government will be settled, not by the noble Lord who has just sat down, but by the nation at large, and I venture to prophesy that when this Bill becomes law, as it will do before very long, the Government, through the results coming down from this measure, will be handed down to posterity as the Government which has done more for temperance than any Government that has existed for the last fifty years. It is quite unnecessary for me to talk about the evil of intemperance in this House. We are all agreed that the evil is enormous, and that a reduction of public-houses is absolutely necessary if we want to promote temperance. That opinion, I know, was not held in former years by a number of persons in high authority, but we are all agreed at the present moment, and both the Majority and Minority Reports of the Royal Commission agree that it is absolutely essential that the number of licensed houses should be largely reduced. I prefer the words of the Minority Report, because that says the number of public houses should be "immediately and largely reduced."

We are all agreed, then, as to the object we have in view, and if we are agreed upon that I am sure, in this House at all events, that each Member will give to the other full credit for doing what each thinks the best for carrying out that object. I greatly approve of this measure and I approve of it for four reasons. First of all it gives a practical measure for the reduction of licences, secondly, it gives an equitable measure of dealing with existing licences, thirdly, it gives improved provisions, greatly improved provisions, for dealing with new licences, and fourthly and lastly, 33,000 beerhouses are put by it under magisterial control. To those four reasons I add a fifth, which is that for the first time, so far as I know, in the history of licensing legislation this Bill attempts to draw a statutory distinction between hotels and simple liquor shops. I have always wondered the distinction was not drawn before, but in this Bill it is drawn between hotels, that is, houses providing for the public food and board and lodging and where drink is only an accessary, and those houses open for the sale of drink and nothing more. I think that is a great advantage, I hope the distinction will always be maintained, and that it will be put to a practical use at some future time.

After the exposition of the law which we have had from the noble Earl on the Woolsack it would be almost impertinent for me to add anything, because, as I understand, the law, as the noble Earl has laid it down on the question of renewals, is that there is an absolute judicial discretion for renewals of licences in the licensing magistrates—judicial not capricious—that makes all the difference, and that the magistrates have as much an unfettered discretion to determine whether they will grant a licence to a man who has held it before as they have to determine whether they will grant a new licence. To adopt the Lord Chancellor's own words it is not a renewal of a licence, it is the granting of another licence for another year. I believe that properly describes what is falsely called the renewal of a licence. If that is the law, and that is the power the magistrates have had, how is it they have not exercised that power in the way some noble Lords opposite wish they had done. It seems to me the answer is as clear as possible; they have very rarely refused a renewal. The Report of the Royal Commission on this point says—

> "It will be seen by the Returns before referred to that the justices very rarely refused the renewal of a licence on the sole ground that it was not required."

And then the Report goes on to say—

> "If compensation could be granted, their action would probably be different."

I believe, my Lords, the reason why the justices have not done away with a great many licences is because of the hardships they would inflict. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, in giving judgment in that well-known case, said—

> "I am very far indeed from saying that, assuming the complete discretion that I have indicated to exist, it would be likely that the persons exercising it would consider an original application in the same way as one which was applied for by the person who had already been licensed for one year. Of course, the justices would remember that a year before a licence had been granted, and presumably (unless some change during the year was proved) they start with the fact that the topics to which I referred have already been considered, and one would not expect that those topics would be likely to be re-opened, unless, as I say, some change has been proved. This would be likely to limit the inquiry to the conduct of the house and the character of the licensee, and perhaps the condition of the house, but as a fact and not as a matter of law at all."

These topics would be likely to be re-opened if the discretion of the magistrates is unfettered. Let me take another case. Suppose the justices are willing in a particular town or district to take away, say, ten licences out of forty, and in their opinion ten licences ought to be done away with. The question arises how are they to do it. These houses, which I am speaking of, we will suppose are all perfectly well conducted by the licensees, and the difficulty of the magistrates is this—they have to say to A, B, and C, "We are not going to disturb your licences because you have conducted your houses very well," but they say to X, Y, and Z, "Although you have conducted your houses well, we are bound to diminish the licences by three and we will strike you out through no fault of your own." How are they to decide fairly who are to be struck off and who are to be kept on. That is an intolerable position for the justices to occupy, and I have never heard anyone give an answer to that plain argument as to why you are going to allow the licences of A, B, and C to remain while you take away their licences from X, Y, and Z for the benefit of the public, and strike them off without compensation. That fact is rather referred to in the Majority Report which says—

> "Besides the feeling just referred to there is the difficulty which arises from determining which house is to be selected for suppression."

That is my A B C argument over again. As a matter of fact we are at a deadlock. The magistrates have the power, but they refuse to exercise it because they think they would be doing an injustice, and they are guided quite rightly by the old maxim that you are not to do evil that good may come. I believe this Bill to be an honest attempt to get rid of that deadlock which we are in at the present moment, and that it is an attempt to enable the justices to exercise all the duties placed upon them and to discharge their functions without injury to anyone.

And now in regard to the machinery. To begin with, several objections have been made, especially by the noble Viscount who brought this matter before us. I am not going into what I may be allowed to call the special pleadings put forward by the noble Lord who has just sat down. If they were brought forward for the purpose of improving the Act where he thinks it unworkable, then they are matters which ought to be dealt with in Committee and not now. If the noble Lord has Amendments to propose which he thinks would mend the Bill in its working let us consider them by all means in order to see if the Bill can be improved. My point is that they are matters more of detail and matters of special pleading, and I shall dismiss them without giving such an answer as the noble Lord might have expected from me. Now I come to a serious point raised by the noble Viscount, and that is the objections he raised to the tribunal. He says that you have taken away the motive power of the justices, and he has put this in various ways; he also says that this Bill robs the brewster sessions of their disciplinary power; anyone who carefully reads this Bill will find that it does nothing of the kind. I am very strongly in favour of brewster sessions. I was rather surprised to hear the noble Viscount press this as much as he did, because it is owing to the action of brewster sessions that you have got as many licences as you have. You would not have had this superabundant number of licences but for the action of brewster sessions from year to year. Therefore, I was rather surprised to hear the noble Viscount stand up so very strongly for the brewster sessions. I think brewster sessions is a most admirable institution, and I should be sorry to see them interfered with in any way, but to say that you destroy their disciplinary power is inaccurate, because you do nothing of the kind. The magistrates have just as much power under this Bill to make conditions in regard to back-yards and doors, and everything of that kind, and their disciplinary power remains exactly as it was. But when you come to deal with the redundant licences of persons who have conducted their houses well, then this change is made: the justices are to consider in brewster sessions which houses, in their opinion ought to be closed, and they make a list of those houses. They have to send that report on to the quarter sessions; the quarter sessions have no initial power, and that power still remains vested in the brewster sessions, where I think we all want it to remain. The brewster sessions report to the quarter sessions, and after considering their report, quarter sessions may act and affirm the recommendations of the brewster sessions on payment of compensation. That is just all that is wanted. Now what is the difference? Under the present law the initial action lies with the local bench; but under this Bill the initial action will lie with the local bench where it was before. You have not destroyed their jurisdiction in any form or shape. What you are going to do is that instead of saying to the local bench: "You must decide this question for yourselves," you leave the applicants, who have been refused, power to go to the quarter sessions. You say that the local bench must send their report to quarter sessions, where anybody who is interested may be heard against the renewal, even persons who do not wish it to be renewed, simply because they do not want public-houses at all. I say that that is a cheaper and easier form of procedure than you have had before.

As to the objection to quarter sessions which was raised by the noble Lord who spoke last, who said that they had no knowledge, and that they could not deal with this compensation fund, and that they would have to go to the Inland Revenue, I may say that, in my opinion, quarter sessions are about the most able body of men you could get to deal with the compensation fund, and to distribute it in different parts of their area. They will act without the slightest feeling one way or the other, because they are men accustomed to acting judicially, and I do not think that any fault would be found with their decision.

Another objection is taken in regard to this matter of compensation. I think we all agree that there must be compensation of some kind. I think the noble Viscount himself said so, and it was stated in the Minority Report that there should be compensation. They all took the same view upon that point, but they had a different point of view in this way. There are certain people who say that there ought to be compensation as a matter of justice, although they do not say as a matter of right. Another speaker has said that the licence-holders ought to have it as a matter of expediency, or equity, or grace. But all are agreed that they ought to have it, and now the question comes, what are we to do? I will deal first with the question that the licence-holders should have it as a matter of justice; the terms of the valuation are put into the Bill, and I have not heard any complaints to the effect that they are too large. Complaint has been made as to the mode of compensation, but I think it is a very simple matter. You take the value of the house without a licence, and the value of the house with a licence, and then you find out what it is that you are to charge for. What do you do in regard to your rates and taxes, and your death duties? You charge them on precisely the same principle, and if a man is to be charged in regard to rates, taxes, and death duties upon this principle, is not that a very fair basis on which to calculate the question of compensation? When you desire to value this property for the purposes I have mentioned, is it fair to say you will take your valuation at such a rate for these particular purposes, and when you apply your principle for public-house purposes to take it at another price? Let us have justice all round, and if you think this valuation is wrong, I hope you will induce His Majesty's Government to adopt another principle in regard to the death duties. I do not think they are likely to do that, and therefore we must take the principle in this Bill as we find it.

In a matter of this kind a state of things has grown gradually for which no particular persons are specially to blame, but where there has been expediency in regard to renewal as there was in the case of the leases which the noble Lord on the Woolsack has cited. I say there is a particular tenure which we have in some parts of the North of England, where a man has a lease not for a year or two years but for a certain term, and although there is nothing said about renewal, it is renewed because it is the custom of the country, and the man who has the lease never thinks of applying for a renewal except formally, and it is always granted on payment of a nominal fee. But the licensee has the expediency and he ought to be treated accordingly. This is being done for a public purpose and when you take away property or expectation compulsorily for a public purpose, you ought to compensate the owner fairly, and you ought to be generous as well as just. Let me remind your Lordships of what took place some years ago at the time of the abolition of purchase of commissions in the Army. That was done for a public purpose, and full compensation was given under the Act. There were regulation allowances as your Lordships are aware, which I suppose, whether they were strictly legal or not, were considered as legal. They were over-regulation prices which were absolutely illegal, but by the custom of certain regiments they had always been paid, and when they came to compensate the owners of those commissions the Act of Parliament said that where the custom of the regiment had been that over-regulation prices had been paid as a matter of custom the officers should be compensated on the full price of the over-regulation price. Therefore I say that when you come to take away a right or expectation or anything else which is property you ought to be generous as well as just. What does the Majority Report say?—

> "Without attempting to weigh too nicely the whole of these arguments, we desire to express—in the case of suppression of licensed houses under the proposed scheme—our general adhesion to the principle of compensation equivalent to the fair intrinsic selling value of the licence and goodwill, apart from the extreme inflation of prices caused, in some cases, by excessive competition. And this we do on the general ground of justice and expediency, and we desire to lay especial emphasis on the following considerations:—
>
> "(*a*.) To suppress a proportion of the licences without compensation, or for a fractional compensation, is to inflict very material loss on one set of licensees, arbitrarily selected, and to benefit the remainder by the elimination of their rivals. It is difficult to believe that any such measure would receive the assent of Parliament, or, if it did, that a licensing authority could be found willingly to undertake the invidious duty of selection."

Let me now come to the other school that has been talked of, because we have had some rather wonderful plans proposed about compensation, and one of the plans, as I understand it, which has been proposed is this: that you are to allow a licensee as a matter of compensation to have a continued licence for a certain number of years. If it is unjust to take away his licence now, is it not equally unjust to take it away, say, at the end of seven years. It is said that the licensee would be able to compensate himself in that time, if you give him ample notice. Suppose you give him notice that at the end of that period his licence will cease; what is the use of giving the man a notice of that kind? How is he to compensate himself? Is he to sell more liquor and adopt some other way of inducing customers to come to his house? I do not understand what is meant by giving a man notice that his licence will be taken away and in the meantime he is to compensate himself. It is entirely past my comprehension, and perhaps some noble Lords, who are wiser than I will explain it.

Now I come to the Amendment of the noble Viscount. I think it would be much better to propose that the Bill be read a second time this day three months, because that is a much simpler way of dealing with the matter, and it would have taken in all the arguments. It is the good old-fashioned way of dealing with this matter, and I like the old-fashioned way. Supposing we refused to pass the noble Viscount's Amendment, we should be saddled with the Bill, and that Amendment would be practically disposed of for ever. As to this Amendment, the noble Viscount speaks of a perpetual interest in a terminable licence. He very wisely did not use the word "freehold," but that is the word which is used outside. Upon this point I would ask two or three questions. Is a man, or a licensee who is in the position to be dispossessed of his licence for his own misconduct like a person who has got a freehold? I do not think that noble Lords would like to hold their own properties on such terms. If the licensee is liable to be dispossessed at any moment, how can he be said to have a freehold? I do not think your Lordships would like to be dispossessed of your lands on receipt of some miserable *solatium*. I am old enough to remember the debates upon the old Land Acts when the Irish tenants were very much engaged in troubling themselves as to how they could best get possession of their landlords' property, and this matter was seriously brought forward by some of them. They said that the landlords of Ireland had had the land for a long time, and it never was theirs really; but they said, "We will allow them to keep it for ten or fifteen years and then we will have it at a prairie value." That does not seem to me to be an argument which your Lordships would like to pursue to its bitter end at all events. In the Minority Report a term of seven years is suggested, but that would be just as much an infringement of the principle as if it was a permanent interest in terminable licences. Is it not wrong altogether to assume that at the end of the seven years a great number of licences will have been destroyed? There are a great many more licences that you would like still to destroy but you can only do it through the brewster sessions in the first instance. Do you think that the brewster sessions at the end of seven years would be any more likely to commit that wrong and that evil by forfeiting a man's licence without compensation than they are now? You come back to precisely the same state of things, viz., that the justices would feel just as reluctant to take away a man's licence, and you would come to the same deadlock in which we are to-day.

Our hope is, in spite of all that noble Lords have held out on the other side, that there will be a large compensation fund, and that it will be employed to dispose of an enormous number of licences. The noble Earl, Lord Onslow, quoted statistics from the London County Council, and they showed to your Lordships that there would not be a very large sum, and that they would not be able very largely to reduce the number of licences in the area of London. Yes, but they did not make the case half strong enough. They drew up their statistics according to the way in which they have had to deal with property when they have had to purchase public-houses for the purposes of public improvements. I think I have had as much experience in this matter as most people, because many years ago we caused property to be purchased for public improvements when I passed in 1875 the Acts for clearing away the rookeries of London. When we came to purchase a public-house, what happened? They brought in a valuer, and they brought in their books and showed their profits, consequently, this raised the amount which the local authorities had to pay—and it did come to an enormou sums. If the London County Council have taken that as the basis of the figures which have been given by Lord Onslow, I do not wonder that the number of public-houses they would be able to shut up is not very great. But in this Bill they do nothing of the kind. No books showing profits would be allowed to be produced. They could not call in people to say that the house was worth so much and that they were making £1,000 a year profit, because it would not be listened to, and it could not be brought forward under this Bill. The valuation which is to be considered is simply the difference between the value of a house with a licence and the value of a house without a licence. Therefore if the London County Council were to revise the estimate which they have given to the noble Earl, Lord Onslow, they would find that they would be able to shut up double the number of houses.

At this period of the evening I am sure I do not want to detain your Lordships, but I have a great objection to this time limit, and I do not think it would work. I may point out that I happen to be the chairman of an old society known as "The Society of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions," who sit in London and meet two or three times a year. I brought this question of the Bill before them. In the first instance they approved the principle of the whole Bill absolutely. Remember these are men who are accustomed to deal with questions of licensing in quarter sessions, and they are men of business with no political sympathy one way or the other, but who simply do their public duty honestly and straightforwardly, and they are most experienced men. When the question of the time limit was mooted I summoned another meeting of this society after the question had been argued in the House of Commons and after a division had been taken upon it. I may say that there was only one man at that meeting who spoke in favour of the time limit, and he was a gentleman who had made a speech to that effect in the House of Commons the night before. At this meeting no one answered him and he would not go to a division, and the resolution that absolute resistance should be offered against the insertion of a time limit was carried *nemine contradicente.* Remember these were men of wide experience and broad views, who were just as much in favour of temperance as any of your Lordships, whether belonging to the Church of England or the Nonconformists.

I must say one word in regard to a matter suggested from the other side of the House, namely, that there could be no difference of opinion between Churchmen and Nonconformists in reference to the question of temperance. As a Churchman I have advocated every temperance movement that I could. In sitting as the chairman of quarter sessions, I do not think I have ever granted a licence where the local magistrates had refused it, and I am certain in my own mind that if this Bill is allowed to pass through your Lordships' House as it is—a few Amendments may be necessary—the practical result will be a large diminution in the number of public-houses from one end of the country to the other, and I also believe there will be a great advance in the cause of temperance. I thank your

Lordships for the patience you have shown me.

*THE EARL OF CARLISLE: I think the machinery of this Bill seems rather cumbrous, and when we come to examine it I believe we shall find in the noble Marquess's speech a better reason for the introduction of this Bill than those which have been given to the House. The noble Marquess said the trade in drink is good and that this Bill is necessary as a precaution to prevent the suppression of licences. If that is the real purpose and meaning of this Bill, how idle it is by doubtful figures to try and prove that the existing diminution of licences will be increased. A great deal is made of the case of the ante-1869 beerhouses, and it is said that these houses will for the first time be dealt with and diminished by this Bill. But, my Lords, the diminution of these beerhouses has been going on without any help from this Bill. I believe it is not generally known that beerhouses have diminished from 49,000 in 1869 to, I believe, 27,000 at the present time. I wish I could feel certain that that diminution would go on under the present Bill at an equally fast rate. The noble Marquess said yesterday that no temperance reformer in his wildest moments ever proposed to tamper with the title of the ante-1869 beerhouses, and that, I have no doubt, is likely to be proved. When Sir Henry Selwyn-Ibbetson dealt with this question he proposed to put all on-licences under the jurisdiction of the magistrates, but favoured the off-licences, and they were left in an advantageous position. But Mr. Ritchie, in his Bill of 1880 and 82, put the off-licences under the jurisdiction of the magistrates, and they were in an equally favoured position and had an equal Parliamentary title. Nevertheless they were put under the ordinary jurisdiction of the magistrates without any time limit or title to compensation, and the consequence of that was that they were diminished wholesale. No less than 436 of these licences disappeared in the first four years after that Act, and the consequence was that in a place called Darwen where thirty-three out of seventy beerhouses had been done away with by the magistrates, there was a celebrated case which brought out, on appeal, the remarkable declaration of Mr. Justice Field, who stated that the Legislature recognised no vested interest at all in any holder of a licence. Then it was that Mr. Nash, the legal adviser of the trade, made that remarkable statement which the right rev. Bishop has quoted just now, in which he stated that what had long been a trade secret was now known to the public, namely, that any licence whatever could be withdrawn at the will of the magistrates. And yet the noble Marquess says that after that statement was published to the trade, nine years before the "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" case, that nobody suspected the existence of this power before the "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" case. After the "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" case there came other judgments and a growing declaration of legal opinion upon the subject, and more and more, in different parts of the country, magistrates acted on the advice which they had received. Then came Lord Peel's Commission, and that Commission made an exhaustive inquiry into the state of things, and they censured the magistrates for not acting upon the legal powers which they possessed. No doubt very often they did not act on account of the ignorance which Lord Belper told us they were in, but after Lord Peel's Commission it was impossible to suppose that there was any longer any doubt upon the matter, and the decision of Lord Peel's Commission was endorsed and sanctioned by His Majesty's Government in the legislation of 1902.

After Lord Peel's Commission had instructed magistrates to act upon their powers, and after the Government had approved apparently of the recommendations of that Commission, it was certainly a surprise that there should be an abrupt turn on the part of the Government. That abrupt turn was shown by Mr. Balfour's reception of a trade deputation. A great deal has been said about the reception of that deputation, but I only want to say this particular thing about it, that when we are considering the broad equities of which Mr. Balfour spoke, it seems to me most extraordinary and most contrary to any equity, either broad or otherwise, that he should have denounced the action of the magistrates, apparently solely on the statements that were furnished to him by the trade. There is no evidence whatever that either the Prime Minister or the noble Earls who have spoken from the opposite Bench took any pains to discover the real facts in regard to the licences that were suppressed by certain benches of magistrates. At the time when the Prime Minister made that remarkable declaration these decisions were still before quarter sessions, and they were afterwards largely confirmed by quarter sessions. Have any members of the Government inquired what quarter sessions thought of the statement which was then made? I very much doubt it. But at all events, if these statements were just, and if Mr. Balfour was right in denouncing the injustice done by the magistrates, it seems to me that a great injustice was done to those publicans who did not have their licences renewed in the year 1903. Why should the publican be protected from the arbitrary action of the bench in 1905, and not be protected and compensated in 1903? It seems to me that if there is an adequate ground for this Act it ought to be retrospective. I do not believe that any injustice was done, because the licences which were lost in 1903 were fully compensated.

There is another inquiry which ought to have been made before any legislation of this kind was proposed, and I believe there has been no inquiry at all into the matter. The matter I allude to is to what extent were the licences, which have been lost, already insured? We have had a statement made and quoted again and again that it is no longer possible to insure licences, but I have not seen any evidence to support that statement. We have, on the contrary, evidence in figures showing the extent to which one large company has insured licences all over the country. That is not the only kind of insurance, because there are different methods of insurance in the North-East of England, where a large body of brewers do not insure in that manner, but simply pool their losses. They agree that they shall jointly pay for any licence that may not be renewed. It has been stated that in some congested districts it would be excessively difficult to insure a licence, but I do not believe that that difficulty can exist in the case of brewers or brewery companies owning a large number of licences, because they can insure them *en bloc*. I admit that this argument may apply to an isolated free house, and it may possibly apply to some publicans who are tenants of a brewery, for they may find it difficult to insure their interest in the house. I think if this Bill had been limited to insuring the interest of free houses and of tenants' licences, which the holders might otherwise have found a difficulty in insuring, there would not have been much to say against this Bill. It appears to me that all the arguments that have been used in favour of this Bill have supposed that these free houses were those to which it applied mainly, whereas we have been told over and over again that the number of free houses in the country only amounts to some 10 or, at the most, 20 per cent. of the whole.

We have been told that reduction will go on under this Bill, and a great deal of argument has been used by the noble Lord on the Woolsack and others as to the questionable benefit of a reduction in licences. I believe that there may be some doubt as to the actual benefit of such a reduction, but I think there can be no doubt as to the value of non-renewal as a disciplinary power in the hands of the bench. That, I think, is brought out very clearly by the Liverpool case, about which Lord Spencer quoted some figures, but I do not think he brought out the particular case to which I will allude. The decrease in the criminal statistics of Liverpool were so very remarkable that deputations were sent from Glasgow and other towns to inquire into the manner in which Liverpool had been able to produce such an extraordinary effect upon its police statistics, and what they reported was that it was this power of non-renewal which had made the lower class of publicans compete in order not to be the lowest on the list, and it was this that had caused so much improvement in the police conditions of Liverpool. We have been told that nothing very material will be altered in the procedure of the magistrates—I mean the licensing procedure—under this Bill. The licensing procedure is already one of very great complication, and it was only after a very great deal of trouble, after a very great number of decisions in the High Court, and a number of experiments in the matter, that brewster sessions throughout the country were beginning to understand what their powers were and how they could act most advantageously. Now under this Bill all that is being mixed up again, partly no doubt because the matter has not been fully discussed in the other House, but not solely on that ground. I think it is impossible, with the best will in the world, to understand many questions that will arise under this Bill. I think it has not been sufficiently shown to us whether the committee of quarter sessions will, under this Bill, be sitting as a Court or only as an administrative body. Those of us who have taken part in licensing business know that a great deal depends upon that question. Of course the brewster sessions are an administrative body and the quarter sessions to which appeal goes sit as a Court. Now I do not understand that it has anywhere been distinctly stated which of these the committee of quarter sessions will be. Apparently it is intended that they should be a Court, but I cannot understand how, if they are to be a Court, the magistrates will be able to communicate with them in order to express their views. That is one of the complications which seem to me to arise out of the present procedure. By the legislation of 1902, it was made plain and declared that the magistrates were in all cases to have their expenses paid by the country. I am not quite certain under this Bill who will pay those expenses when they are incurred or whether they will be paid at all. That is one of the points which strikes me as excessively doubtful. I rather agree with the noble Viscount, Lord Cross, that it would not have been undesirable to move that this Bill be read this day three months. But at the same time I believe that if we are able to get a time limit inserted in the Bill, at all events we shall be able to look forward to a time when it will no longer be possible to interfere with any improvements in the transaction of our licensing business.

*THE BISHOP OF DURHAM: The House is so thin at the present moment that I feel that I owe an apology for detaining your Lordships even for a few minutes. I wish only to say a few words, in which I desire to give some of the reasons which have induced me earnestly to support the most rev. Primate in his Motion for a time limit. I have listened with the keenest attention to the arguments which have been put forward on both sides of the House, both yesterday and to-night, and if I am forced into the position of dissenting from this Bill, it is certainly not from any feelings of political rancour. I am one of those who consider that in many directions, both of home and Imperial action, we owe a great debt of gratitude to His Majesty's Government; but in a matter affecting such vast interests as are here involved it is impossible to look upon this Bill in any other way except upon its own merits, and upon those merits I feel constrained to forbode results greatly to be deplored if this Bill passes into law without a time limit. The whole aspect and colour of compensation seems to me to be affected by that matter. Compensation by a time limit seems to me to be the most reasonable of things. I will not debate the word "equitable," for I would rather use the word "considerate." It seems to me that the time limit is a considerate form of long notice, which provides that at the close of such and such a period the State desires to reaffirm and reinforce a principle which has always been present from the first, since the trade in strong drink came at all to the front in English life as a matter to be considered by the law. It has surely been looked upon as a thing exceptional in its conditions and requirements, and a thing of exceptional danger, as touching the moral life of the nation at vulnerable points. I take it that the phrase in the Licensing Bill of 1828, which has so often been referred to, making the tenure of a licence to run "for one year and no longer," is a significant phrase. Those words are emphatic terms, which — and I say this with profound deference to the remarks made by the noble Lord upon the Woolsack—are not to the plain man quite the same thing as the conditions of an annual lease under the ordinary conditions of landlord and tenant. This phrase in the Licensing Bill of 1828 has a history behind it, and it signifies a recognition that there shall be particular reserves and particular safeguards in regard to a matter which touches the moral public life of England at tremendously vulnerable points. If I have read aright the story of legislation of generation after generation, in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, the principle which has been reaffirmed is that in the traffic in strong drink you have had to deal with a matter which demands peculiar safeguards. Therefore, I think that nothing should be done now which will make it more difficult in the future for the State to affirm and enforce its rights to exercise an abnormally severe control over the traffic in strong drink. It seems to me that as far as an Act of Parliament can make it perpetual, the enactment of perpetual monetary obligations in regard of the reduction of the number of licensed houses against which no special fault is alleged, is a thing to be deplored. If I may repeat my phrase, let the considerate long notice be given, and my cordial approval to such an act of practical equity is certainly at hand. But to let it be made a perpetuity would, I venture to think, be to take a step which is most perilous, and one which is altogether out of line with the past in regard to the view the State has taken of this trade and its risks.

I would further say that this Bill gives me great misgivings, however reluctant misgivings, because of the new position in which it seems to put the action of the brewster sessions. We are told that considerable powers are still left to brewster sessions. The disciplinary powers referred to just now are of course considerable, and I trust they will be used. The recent action of many benches of magistrates has not, I think, been characterised by intemperance or violence. I believe there is very little risk of that. But I think there has been a growing consciousness of public duty in this matter, not only in regard to the trade but also in regard of the public, and the public in some places needs to be protected against itself. But surely, my Lords, a great and serious difference is made when brewster sessions are allowed only to send recommendations with regard to the non-renewal of licences other than those refused on grounds of misconduct. I am told by those who have had experience and who are fair and impartial witnesses, that it is a widely different thing for quarter sessions to reverse a decision of the brewster sessions, and to merely pass by a recommendation with a view to the suppression of such and such a house. Another point which I think has been mentioned is that in many cases, as a matter of fact, no appeal whatever is entered against the decision of brewster sessions. Case upon case hitherto has been practically settled without reference to quarter sessions at all. Under the new legislation every case which has to do with a house not affected by charges of misconduct or mismanagement must, without exception, go before quarter sessions, and I venture to say from such experience as I have had of intercourse with local magistrates and with men of the greatest experience in the county with which I have most to do, that this mere leave to make a recommendation to quarter sessions is looked upon as a grave and serious restriction of the powers of the local magistrates.

May I make a further remark upon that matter? It has been suggested in the course of this debate that often in the past temperance advocates have spoken with little confidence of the conduct of the local magistrates. It may be that it is so, but I venture to think that a new state of things has now arisen, and a state of things which should be welcomed and fostered and not discouraged. I think that after a considerable period of apathy in regard to national intemperance we are now coming to a better state of public feeling, and public opinion is advancing upon this question. Public opinion for temperance is making itself sensibly felt in our large centres of population, and it is reflected, and in a large measure expressed, by the attitude of local magistrates in regard to temperance questions. I see no signs in the great communities with which I have in some measure now to deal of any violent, revolutionary, intemperate, or inequitable action on the part of the magistrates, but I do see what is infinitely to be rejoiced in, and that is a recognition of a growth in the public consciousness that there is a great public trust confided to brewster sessions, that the eyes of a large and increasing section of the public are now open, and that the local authorities will do what they can in the matter of reducing the present enormous temptations to the public to indulge to excess in strong drink.

May it never be forgotten that this is an evil of abnormal proportion. I remember thirty years ago at a meeting of temperance workers in Cambridge some words used by the late Professor Francis Newman. He said that in regard to drink we had to deal with a convulsive evil which would require a convulsive remedy. I do not ask for a convulsive remedy in regard to this Bill, but I do not desire by any possibility to intensify the evil. It is a convulsive evil and it requires a remedy to be applied as much as possible with all possible regard to the interests which in any degree whatever are connected with the maintenance of that evil. On the other hand let me not be thought to say one word either intemperate or unfair about the great brewing industry. There are brewers who are among the examples of the world in every private and public virtue. Many brewers in the past have been among the greatest philanthropists that have ever lived. I have the privilege of having among my friends men connected with that industry, and I know one whose whole heart is stirred to its depths with the desire to do what he can to give a better direction to the trade, and I know that many publicans are men good, true, and estimable. But then we must not forget that we have to deal with a prodigious commercial interest whose business it is not to do good, but to make profits, and especially is that the case when the interest takes the form of a limited liability company, which has to consider how to keep up dividends for hungry investors. These great companies and firms are the owners of the vast majority of the public-houses in this country, and last night the noble Lord, Earl Grey, reminded us of some of the conditions and gave us some facts and results in regard to trust public-houses in which he is interested. And in passing he spoke of the tied-house system, and asked, with regard to the manager of a tied house, what is his business? His business is to sell as much strong drink as he can. I think the actual phrase was that it is his duty to do this and therefore we cannot complain of it. I do not think the word duty has ever been used in that connection before. This is a specimen of the conditions under which this enormously powerful interest has to do its work, and from a commercial point of view it cannot help working in this way. All I have to say is that we are dealing not with estimable individuals, but with a vast trading interest, and it is the business of the State in this case to do all it can to protect and to raise the morals of the people.

I am forced, my Lords, to pay special attention to this question by my position and by my duty. I come from a county and diocese which, alas, has a bad record from an intemperance point of view. There is a map of England issued which is marked so as to show the number of arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. It is marked in various colours, and some parts of it are coloured with a beautiful grey, while some are almost midnight black, and, alas, there is a great thunder cloud at the top of the map which represents the counties of Durham and Northumberland. I know it is easy to argue a matter of this sort, a question of morals in the abstract amidst the quiet of the library, but if we go out into the scenes where the drink industry in the public-houses is doing its work, we find it is a very different thing. I was not very long ago walking through one of our great towns with one of those admirable and absolutely self-devoted clergymen whom it is my privilege to serve. We were not content with perambulating the streets, but we saw what the interiors of these places were like. I was directed to a one-roomed tenement, where we found a highly-skilled workman slowly recovering from his drunkenness. The man was perfectly willing to listen to us, as we gave him our hearty sympathy and what would be called a "straight talk," and the hand of friendship and help. But what was the condition of things about him? The street, the district, he lived in was a network of temptation. I repudiate altogether the idea that all the guilt and blame is to be concentrated upon the drunkard. I know he is responsible and he is guilty, but God knows that the temptations under which the men who throng those one-roomed and two-roomed tenements live often amount to almost compulsion into this particular form of sin. Not far from this place was a comparatively small public-house, the "Ord Arms" which suddenly sprung to what was estimated at about twenty times its previous value, and sold for £28,000. And why? Because it was expected that a new development of the vast Elswick Works would take place. It was expected that a new gateway from these works would be opened opposite this public-house, and not only would the workmen be tempted to drink at the end of the day but they would be tempted to take a nip at five o'clock in the morning when going to their work. It is because I fear that this Bill will in the future, as far as an Act can do it, put a new character upon the tenure of licences and give them a new legitimacy of claim in the eye of the law, and again, because it will remove a most useful and now growing agency—that of the awakening conscience of the local licensing justices—from the position of authority it has hitherto held—it is for these reasons that I earnestly hope that, if this Bill passes into law, it will be with a time limit which will give a right character to the compensation scheme.

*LORD KINNAIRD: There is a large amount of feeling throughout the country on this matter, and I hope this debate will show that those of us who strongly object to this Bill in its present form desire to see the Amendment of the noble Viscount Lord Peel carried. I hope it will go to the country that we do not desire to treat this question with any feeling of unfairness to those who may be affected by the passing of the Bill. For fear that it may be thought that there is no answer to some of the arguments which have been used I venture to trouble your Lordships for a few minutes. First of all it seems to me that this Bill can hardly be called a temperance measure. It is as is announced on the back of the Bill, a Licensing Bill. It is a Bill to secure considerable perpetuity of tenure to licences which are at present held for twelve months and no longer. While we desire to treat a large industry fairly, we cannot, on the other hand, see that this is a Bill which will make for temperance. Some remarkable speeches have been delivered by the right rev. Prelates who have addressed us, and while we cannot accuse them of having been impetuous in regard to temperance reform or in advocating some of the measures upon which we, who do not object to call ourselves fanatics, feel so strongly, we are very glad that the whole of the Bishops, as far as they have spoken, have called upon His Majesty's Government to consider carefully whether there may not be some strong Amendment of this Bill made on the lines indicated by the most rev. Primate.

Reference has been made only once or twice in this House, but it has been referred to as a strong argument in the country in favour of the perpetuity of licences, that this property pays death duties on the full value. I fully admit that there are two sides to many of the points raised in this Bill, but some of us think that we understand figures. We may make mistakes, but we are able to face an argument of that kind, and I think your Lordships will agree that what I am going to state is fair and reasonable. Death duty is paid because that was the value which competent valuers put upon it as part of the testator's property at the time or near the time of his death. I believe I am correct in saying that there is an appeal if the value of licensed property is put too high. Supposing a man had a property of £200,000, and held three or four licensed houses worth £50,000. That is the market value at the present time. He would pay a certain proportion, say 10 per cent., upon that value, just as he would upon South African or other gold mines. It is not a question of what these licensed houses or these shares would be worth in a short time, but of what they are worth at the present time. It seems to me that the new buyer of licensed property does not get any better title than the rest of the holders of licensed property, and he would probably be advised that it was not a property which children should hold or which he as an executor ought to hold for them. I fail to see if he realises that property and has paid 10 per cent. death duty upon it, that there is any hardship in paying the duty, but if the executors retain it they must take the chance of holding that risky property.

Another argument which has been used is that we must not interfere for public purposes with certain interests which have grown up. We claim to be part of an Empire, and therefore we are able to look over the Empire and to see what are the conditions under which licensed property is held in other parts. Those who have studied this question know that very interesting experiments have been tried. I was talking only this afternoon to a gentleman who holds an office under the Government of Canada where they have lately closed several licensed houses, the magistrates having come to the conclusion that there were too many. Out of seventy-five licensed houses, they have closed ten within the last twelve months, and they propose to close ten or fifteen more. The houses that remain (because they get so much more business) make, not by law but by practice, some compensation to those which are closed. Then if you go across the border into the United States, those who study temperance legislation can study it to their heart's content. They will there see some interesting experiments, some successful and others not, but the majority decidedly more successful than the experiments we have tried in this country. I venture to think that these are considerations which ought to have some weight. Then there is another point which seems to me to bear upon the question. Last year we had a Scotch Licensing Bill. I know more about the details of Scotch licensing legislation than about English, though I know something of the latter, having sat as a licensing magistrate. In Scotland we have somehow hitherto arrived at a more satisfactory position with reference to the claims of licence-holders, publicans, brewers, or distillers. They do not in Scotland make the same claim as they do in England, and many people hold the view that England has done nothing to cause her licensing legislation to be so far behind what has become the law across the border.

Then, my Lords, there is another proposal in the Bill which I think is not for the better. Under Clause 1, we find that the public will be no longer able, as they are at present, to go in person and give evidence against the renewal of licences. Anybody who has tried to collect evidence against a licensed house knows how difficult it is, even at present, to obtain satisfaction. I appeal to the right rev. Prelates opposite who know the difficulty their clergy have in this work. They know something of the question through their clergy, and those who come to them for advice. It is very difficult to get even the present magistrates to listen to you, but if you have a certain position, and if above all you get the reputation that you will keep on going to Court until they listen to you, you may then meet with some success. I fully admit that we have had this Bill so short a time in our hands that there has been little opportunity fully to consider it, and I may be told that I entirely misunderstand these words, "quarter sessions may, unless it appears to them unnecessary, allow other persons to appear." I have not the smallest doubt, judging by my past experience, that a great many of the magistrates sitting in quarter sessions will consider it most unnecessary to have troublesome people going in to interfere with their business, and to rake up evidence on matters which they may think to be unnecessary. I have asked one or two lawyers about this matter, and they tell me that in quarter sessions no one has a right to go, whereas the public have a right to go to brewster sessions.

LORD BELPER: In this case a committee of quarter sessions will be sitting—not the court of quarter sessions.

*LORD KINNAIRD: But it is not clear whether the committee of quarter sessions, which is a new body, will be sitting judicially. Will it be sitting as the magistrates used to sit? Of course the whole of my argument on this point falls to the ground if it will still be open for the public to go. But the question has never yet been answered whether or not the public are to be put outside by this Bill. Possibly the point may be further elucidated in Committee. Perhaps the Government will agree to the omission of the words, but that, of course, is a matter for Committee, and not for Second Reading.

A remarkable statement was made by the noble Lord on the Woolsack, to the effect that it was his opinion—he admitted it was only an opinion—that a larger number of licensed houses did not increase drunkenness. I certainly thought that so far as temperance reformers were concerned, nobody would make such a statement as that in the present day. Liverpool for a time had almost free trade in liquor, and that is why Liverpool has the doubtful honour of possessing more licensed houses than almost any other town in the country as well as more drunkenness. The system lasted only a very few months, but it has taken a long time to get rid of the houses then established. I happened to be for a time in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, where I spent an afternoon with a magistrate. There for eighteen months they had free trade in liquor. Anybody who paid his money down for a licence and got twenty people to say that he was a decent fellow could get a licence, and the result was that the number of licences was increased four or fivefold. Within eighteen months there was such a pandemonium that they had to close a number of houses, and this Judge told me the methods by which he selected the public-house. He constituted an open court before which anybody could appear. The liquor seller's friends could go and say what a good fellow he was, that he sold very good liquor, and that he ought to be allowed to go on supplying it; and other people could go and state their view of the case, showing that the house should be closed. On the evidence thus given a certain proportion of the houses were closed, and within a few months a number of others were to be shut up. But I do not think I need labour this point. I believe it is admitted that the number of public-houses, beyond a certain proportion, does increase drunkenness, and I was surprised to hear so illustrious an authority as the Lord Chancellor lay down the contrary proposition.

Then there is one further point, that the licence-holders have a moral right to the continuance of their licences. Your Lordships know that a certain number of the States in the United States of America have "prohibition." On the last occasion of a State deciding to have "prohibition" the licence-holders and brewery companies said they had a right to sell liquor, and the decision of the Supreme Court turned on the moral right of the United States under its Constitution not to give a vested interest in anything contrary to the highest welfare of the community. In regard to questionable places of amusement or gambling houses, where the profits are extremely large, nobody has contended that there should be a vested interest, and why should it be the case in regard to the great evil which we are now discussing?

We are afraid that under this Bill fewer houses will be closed than under the old system. It has been estimated that in Birmingham it will take thirty years—I should be sorry to suggest that all Birmingham figures are correct, but these have been carefully worked out by a gentleman who used to be a great authority in the Unionist Party, and he says that it will take thirty years to do what they looked forward to doing in ten years, everybody agreeing that the number of licensed houses is too large and ought to be reduced. Your Lordships cannot be surprised that we should ask you to pause when we are told that that will be the result of this so-called temperance measure. So far from this Bill being a temperance reform, we consider it to be a measure for the endowment of the liquor traffic with an amount equal to about 50 per cent. more than the endowment of the national Church. I do ask whether it is desirable, with all these evils confronting us, that we should pass this Bill in its present form.

* **EARL STANHOPE**: My Lords, I hope I may be allowed, as one who has had many years experience in the administration of the licensing laws, to say a few words upon this subject. I think it may be admitted, in the first place, that on both sides of the House we are most anxious to see a reduction in the number of public-houses; and I think it may also be admitted that we all desire that compensation in some form should be given. I was very much impressed

by the force and eloquence of the speech made by the noble Viscount, Lord Peel, yesterday afternoon, but I could not altogether accept his views that this Bill would hinder the cause of temperance reform. In the county in which I reside—the county of Kent—I have had many years experience, and I can say that in many of the divisions of that county there has been an earnest desire to reduce the number of public-houses and to do everything possible to promote the interests of temperance reform. I will speak of only two divisions of the county, though steps have been taken in others, but in two divisions there were special committees of the magistrates appointed to go into the question of reducing the number of public-houses—one in West Kent and the other in East Kent. In both cases the committee thought it possible to approach the brewers and to say to them, "We are prepared to renew the licences of the large approved houses that do not possess back-doors and are structurally fit; but we are not prepared to continue the licence of any of the inferior houses to which we wish to put an end." But there was a great difficulty in the matter, which arose in this way. In the first place the ante-1869 public-houses could not be abolished; they had a statutory title. This Bill removes or makes it possible to remove that statutory title. In the next place, the brewers, though quite admitting that there was some force in the view of the committees, said they could not sacrifice income and give up these houses without some form of compensation being granted. I thoroughly believe that this Bill, both because it touches the ante-1869 public-houses, and because it gives a form of compensation provided out of the trade, will effect a very considerable reform. It is scarcely necessary to say that the brewers are possessed of property, and to alienate property without some form of compensation seems to me to be inequitable. Take the case of a butcher, or grocer, or miller. They are paid compensation, though it is called, not compensation, but goodwill. In many instances I have known of a very large goodwill being paid for succeeding to a butcher's or a grocer's business.

It is said that this Bill takes away the power of the local magistrates. But the initiation of all suppression of public-houses on account of their redundancy must emanate from the local benches who have local knowledge. It was not long ago—I am speaking of my own knowledge, and perhaps it is more valuable because it is actual experience—shat we on my own bench at Sevenoaks suppressed a public-house. There was an appeal and the appeal was sustained. Now the reason the larger area is taken in this Bill is that it is impossible to provide sufficient compensation over the smaller area, whereas the larger area will provide the necessary compensation. It seems to my mind very inequitable that the magistrates at quarter sessions, who represent that larger-area, should not have to do with these cases. Local benches must first recommend the suppression of particular houses, and then, if they are at all anxious in the matter of reform, they will attend quarter sessions to back up the cases which they have brought forward. In the recent debate in the House of Commons, Mr. Asquith said that there ought to be no appeal to quarter sessions. I am well acquainted with certain petty sessional divisions in the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk where there are two or three magistrates, one of whom is very often a clergyman, and the country clergy, though I have the greatest possible respect for them, are not always the best men of business, and it is only fair when a sacrifice of property is made that an appeal should be allowed as exists now and as it will exist under the Bill.

Earl Stanhope.

Lord Peel said last night that wretched weakly public-houses would be stimulated to prolong their existence. I think just the contrary. Really and truly, it seems to me that they are about to be abolished. We know very well that they constitute a very large proportion of the worst public-houses—about one-third of the whole number in the country—their customers are the lowest and worst class, they generally have a back door, and I have little doubt myself that, though equity will be promoted and justice done as it always is by the magistrates in every county, the first houses to be sacrificed and compensated will be the ante-1869 houses. They have a statutory title at present, but this Bill provides that while having that statutory title they may be compensated, and I am sure that with a scheme of compensation the brewer will readily meet the justices' views by allowing the withdrawal of the licences of such houses. The most rev. Primate said that if the number of licences was reduced the surviving houses would make a much larger profit. That may be so, but it is impossible to say, though as to a reduction of the number of houses reducing the temptations to drunkenness I have personally very little doubt. I am quite sure that in most instances the better class houses are not frequented by the topers. The better class houses hitherto have commanded better class customers. It is very often said that a man walking to his home passes three public-houses but succumbs to the fourth. Well, under this Bill the fourth will not exist; it will be extinguished.

It is my conscientious conviction, my Lords, that this Bill will tend very greatly to the promotion of temperance. In the county of Kent we have granted no new licences at all for several years, but it has been practically impossible to fail to renew existing licences at brewster sessions on account of the difficulty with regard to compensation. This Bill provides machinery which I have little doubt will tend greatly to diminish the number of public-houses. It is said that last year there were not more than 200 licences suppressed, but it is prognosticated that under this Bill the number will be 2,500.

I should like before I sit down to say a word with regard to the action of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to which reference was made by the most rev. Primate. I have the honour to belong to that body, and I may say that during the last twenty years a large number of licences have been given up. The way in which it has been done is that the licences, having expired, have not been renewed. That really represents a great sacrifice of the income of the Church, but I am sure that my right rev. friends on the Episcopal Bench will readily submit to a diminution of income in such a good cause as that of temperance. It is not at all as it might be in this part of London. The late Duke of Westminster informed me that he had abolished between twenty and twenty-five public houses on his estate without suffering any reduction of income at all. That is easily understandable, because the character of the neighbourhood was improved by the abolition of some of these public-houses. But that is not the case with the Ecclesiastical Commission. Their property is situated in the North of London and in Lambeth, and it is of such a character that I do not think it is improved at all by the withdrawal of a licence. At any rate, the immediate effect is a considerable sacrifice of income in the cause of temperance. The amount of money which has been sacrificed by the abolition of these licences amounts to no less than £300,000 in those twenty or twenty-two years.

It is said that perpetuity is given by one of the clauses of this Bill. I fail to see that machinery to abolish a custom which has become a perpetuity justifies that statement at all. On the contrary, if the annual renewal of a licence has become almost an established fact, so that the licence cannot be suddenly withdrawn, as some of my noble friends imagine, I fail to see that when a Bill is introduced which, for the first time, gives facilities for stopping that custom and enables redundant public-houses to be at once dealt with it can be described as giving perpetuity of tenure. I have no doubt myself that this Bill will tend very greatly to the promotion of the cause of temperance, and therefore I shall have no hesitation in voting against the Amendment moved by the noble Viscount.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS: My Lords, I was very glad when the noble Earl rose just now, because there was a certain monotony in the situation when three serious criticisms were made upon the Bill one after another, and no one rose to refute them. I wish with all my heart that I could give a benediction to the Bill brought in by the Government such as that which has been given by the noble Earl and some others. There are undoubtedly in the Bill points of very great value indeed which I wish to acknowledge, particularly the provisions with reference to the ante-1869 beer-houses and to new licences. But it seems to me that instead of a Bill for the reduction of licences, what we much more want is a Bill for giving freedom to the State in the granting of licences. That His Majesty's Government attribute some merit and some importance to this point of freedom, and of preventing the setting up of a monopoly value, must be deduced from one of their new clauses, in which I observe these words—

> "Such conditions shall, in any case, be attached as, having regard to the proper provisions for good management, the justices think best adapted for securing to the public any monopoly value which is represented by the difference——"

and so on. If His Majesty's Government think it is for the advantage of the State that there should be secured to the public the monopoly value of the new licences which may be given, does it pass the wit of man to devise a Bill which should give at least some portion of the monopoly value of ancient licences to the State instead of to the individual? That is a point I want to make.

Then, in reference to the monopoly value of existing licences, I want to ask one question. My noble friend Earl Grey spoke yesterday upon this point, and while he gave a greater benediction to the Bill than I am able to give, he said, dealing with this point, that unless the Government were able to throw some light upon this question of the monopoly value of existing licences, and to give the public some kind of relief in regard thereto, he should feel it to be his duty to vote for a time limit in some shape or form. So far as I have heard the speeches on this side of the House, there has been no kind of reply given to my noble friend, and, although this point of the increase on the monopoly value of ancient licences has been brought home again and again, no sort of answer has been made on the part of the Government. I want, therefore, to ask plainly whether the monopoly value which now exists, and is increasing, is a monopoly value that you can consider to be free from danger to the country? Let me give one single illustration. Within a mile of the house where I resided when I was Bishop of Newcastle, there was a small hotel belonging to a friend of mine. Without the licence it might perhaps have fetched £1,000 in the market but not more. This small hotel was sold by auction for £28,100. While I was exceedingly glad that my friend, if anyone, should receive this very large profit, for my own part I could not justify on grounds of State such an enormous monopoly value. This house was sold after the decision in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield"; it was therefore sold at a time when the purchaser knew perfectly well that his tenure was precarious, and yet this enormous monopoly value was given, and this enormous speculation perpetrated—I can use no other word. I presume that if magistrates hereafter should think it their duty to try and suppress a licence of that kind, they would be asked to give as compensation the difference between, say, £1,000, the worth of the house without a licence, and the £28,100 which was given for the house with the licence. I cannot believe that it passes the wit of man to find some sort of limit, whatever that limit may be. I am not going to enter into the question of how many years it should be. For my own part I agree very much with the most rev. Primate in the Amendment which he proposes to move when this Bill is in Committee, but that is purely a matter of detail. The point I want to make is simply this. The decision of the Courts having been plainly given that a licence is granted for one year, and one year only, and that therefore there is nothing to prevent the magistrates from refusing to renew that licence, I maintain that it is equitable to give a certain term of years, whatever the term may be, during which the licence may be retained by the present holder, but that after that term of years the authority shall be free to renew or refuse the licence, or, if they think fit, to grant a licence on terms which may be approved by the authority. That seems to me to be the main blot on this Bill. If there were a time limit, I, for my part, should be perfectly willing to accept the Bill; but if there be no time limit I shall feel it my duty to oppose the Bill at every stage. After what has been said by the representatives of His Majesty's Government, and particularly after the somewhat hopeless speech of my noble friend Lord Salisbury, which seemed to me to give no sort of hope whatever upon this matter, I shall feel it my duty to follow the noble Viscount into the Lobby if he divides the House to-night. But if I had some real hope held out that in

Committee His Majesty's Government would give way on the question of the time limit, I should refuse to vote on the Second Reading at all. That is the position in which I stand in reference to this Bill.

Now, my Lords, I should like to touch upon one further point. It is said that there will be a sum of about £1,200,000 available every year for the buying up of licences. Whether that sum is available depends wholly upon whether the various authorities are prepared to charge the full sum allowed by the Bill. I admit that they may do it, and that, if they do, the sum may be £1,200,000. But if you spread that £1,200,000 over the whole country and see how it works out, it is not such a large sum after all. Look at the figures which Mr. Shaw Lefevre has published in to-day's *Times*. I will take one single town in which I lived for nearly eighteen years—Portsmouth. According to Mr. Shaw Lefevre's figures there would be at Portsmouth an annual reduction of four licensed houses, and of three at Southampton. If the authority avails itself to the utmost of its powers of borrowing, there might be sixty licences bought up at Portsmouth and forty-five at Southampton, or about one-fifth or one-sixth of what is considered to be the minimum number of licences which ought to be withdrawn in those two great towns. It does not seem to me that that is any great result or any result at all to be proud of. On the other hand, I think it will have the effect of stopping the process which is at present going on. A considerable reduction has already been brought about in many places, and arrangements have been made again and again with brewers whereby perhaps three or four licences should be given up and one licence given in exchange.

Then there is a further point which I desire to touch upon. There are so many authorities concerned that it is extremely difficult to find out who is responsible for the working of the separate parts of the Bill, but I venture to say that whatever is done there will be a very real difficulty with reference to this monopoly value. Mr. Shaw Lefevre has pointed out in reference to the great towns to which I have referred that the public-houses are as a rule in a few hands. In Portsmouth there are 714 out of 765 licences belonging to thirty-one breweries, one brewery possessing 128, another ninety-eight, another ninety, and so on. I think it incontestable that if you take away a certain number of licences you do increase to a certain extent the value of the remaining licences; whereas if you could proportionately suppress a certain number of licences belonging to these various breweries, you could do it in such a way that the brewers themselves would lose very little. Unless you are able to make some sort of arrangement, whereby you can deduct from the sum paid by way of compensation the increase of emolument accruing to the brewery from the increased value of the licences that remain, you are really compensating the owner twice over, and giving a sum far beyond what the persons aggrieved have any right to demand. I cannot but hope that when the Bill goes into Committee, this question will receive very careful attention indeed on the part of His Majesty's Government.

It is unnecessary to go over the ground which has been so ably covered several times within the course of the debate, and therefore I will only say this in conclusion. Early in the evening the Bishop of London expressed very admirably and lucidly the mind of most of us on this Bench, and I only regret that I did not hear the speech delivered by the Bishop of Durham. But I do say this. There are moral forces in the country which we cannot afford to disregard. The method of compensation to be set up under this Bill is one which pains some of the best people in the country, and it is looked upon by some of the best temperance reformers as an absolutely retrograde step. For my own part, while I have never been and never should be a prohibitionist, and while I have always been in favour of compensation, and should be in favour of even more liberal compensation than was proposed in the other House, I cannot possibly give my consent to this Bill in its present form; I shall therefore feel it my duty to follow the noble Viscount into the Lobby.

The Earl of ABERDEEN: The noble Lord who introduced the Bill observed that it would be a pity, in his estimation, if those who recognise that the Bill contains provisions of which they approve risked the Bill because of one particular feature to which they objected. He was alluding, of course, to the question of a time limit. I think the answer to that observation is that many of us regard the absence of a time limit as so serious a defect that it would outweigh whatever advantages might be found in other parts of the Bill. That surely is a reasonable position and attitude. The Bill as it stands would enact something amounting to the creation of a vested interest. I have listened to what has been said to controvert that proposition, but I do not think we can get rid of the fact that the Bill does import something absolutely new into the Statute-book as to the character of licences and the property they are supposed to represent. A principle of that kind once placed upon the Statute-book is not a very easy thing to remove, even if Parliament desires to remove it. Other features in the Bill are altogether different in character; they are more administrative; and administrative provisions can be modified, improved, enlarged, and so forth. So that if the Bill, as the noble Lord told us, was sacrificed by the carrying of this Amendment, it would, after all, only mean the postponement of those provisions which many, like the right rev. Prelate who has just spoken, regardwith approval. Members on this side of the House welcome the clear and definite utterance of the right rev. Prelate, that so strongly does he feel with regard to the time limit question, that although he approves of many other parts of the Bill he would rather see the Bill thrown out than passed with such a provision omitted With great respect I venture to hope that the right rev. Bench will be inclined to adopt the attitude of the right rev. Prelate in regard to the manner in which they record their vote upon this Amendment, although I can quite understand that some would suggest that the matter should be postponed until the Committee stage, when the most rev. Primate's Amendment comes forward. But I have been a Member of this House for some time, and I venture to predict that on Thursday and Friday, when the Committee stage is taken, there will be a much larger phalanx of Members on the Government Benches, and that if the Government do not give way to-night, they will have considerably greater force behind them during the Committee stage to prevent any such proposal being then carried. We have seen that happen before, so that I hope that those who feel strongly upon this matter will support Lord Peel's Amendment to-night.

The Earl of Aberdeen.

My Lords, we cannot contemplate or discuss this Bill without remembering that it has, so to speak, a past. I am not going to rake up old stories, but it is not unreasonable to have somewhat in view the fact that there have been two prominent episodes in its history. The first is as to its conception. We cannot ignore the fact that there seems to be a strange connection or coincidence between the waiting of certain important deputations upon the Prime Minister and the noble and learned Lord upon the Woolsack, when very strong suggestions and requests were made, and the subsequent introduction of this Bill. Then, without pursuing that point further, but looking at the more recent history of the Bill, although in this House we are not by way of alluding to discussions in the other House of Parliament, yet I suppose it is not irregular to allude incidentally, as I think my noble friend the Duke of Devonshire said the other night, to what is recorded in the Minutes of that other House. If we go no further than the records of the Proceedings we must be aware that the history of this Bill before it came to this House had been of a very remarkable character. A good deal has been said about the Government not being responsible for the wholesale slaughter of Amendments, and so forth, but I really cannot help thinking that the Government, knowing the enormous interest taken in this Bill, might, by some provision or some prearrangement, have provided more time for its discussion. At any rate, the fact remains that there was a very great and severe application of the closure. Just consider what that means in relation to a measure of this kind—a measure of social legislation, and one which so much concerns the interests of the country that there is no topic on which candidates for Parliament are more earnestly questioned, one might almost say catechised. Those candidates who have been returned to Parliament, and who have been thus constituted representatives of the people, were prepared to carry out the mandate given and the views expressed by their constituents, but they have not had the opportunity of doing so. Does not this impose a peculiar responsibility upon this House to secure the fullest discussion of what in ordinary cases would be matters of detail and procedure, but which, owing to the nature of the subject, have now a peculiar and special importance ?

I would like to say here that when allusions are made to the great power and influence of the interest known as the "trade," there is no idea of disparagement in any personal sense. We must all have noticed that the right rev. Prelate, the Bishop of London, in his remarkable and notable speech, incidentally indicated his attitude in that matter when he alluded to the fact that many of those connected with this interest have been foremost in works of philanthropy and so forth. We all recognise that. But we must also recognise the truth of what has been said as to the formidable power of this interest. It is not really the leaders and the representative men in this business, but it is also the fact that the interest is spread through countless shareholders, especially since the introduction of the joint stock system. It may be said that there are other interests which have great power in the State. For instance, there is the railway interest. It is no doubt conceivable that the railway interest may have too much influence and power in the State, but as regards railways it must be remembered that there is a Government Department which has for a large part of its duties the looking after of railways. The Board of Trade imposes upon railway schemes restrictions and obligations which the railway companies often think are superfluous, but they have to be obeyed. At any rate the railway companies are kept very well in order, though doubtless they do know something about combination in a quiet way. It is also to be remembered that if railways have the misfortune to harm anybody they are liable to severe damages and to the payment of compensation to the persons injured.

Leaving that point as to the importance of the trade, I think it should also be borne in mind that throughout the country there are many persons of great zeal and disinterestedness, who for a long time have been devoting energy, thought, and study, to this question of temperance reform, and who, in their various departments of useful energy, whether of religious, philanthropic, or social reform, have obtained experience of this terribly insidious evil, upon which there is no need to enlarge, as we all know something about it. These workers for the welfare of their fellow-creatures have been faced with this formidable evil, and have given their testimony, which testimony I am afraid has not yet been fully and sufficiently considered. The testimony of temperance workers of different creeds, classes, and ranks is in the main that they would deplore the passing of the Bill in its present form. That fact in itself is, I think, an argument in support of Lord Peel's Amendment. At the worst, as I have said, if the Bill is thrown out it is only a matter of postponement. The energy of the Houses of Parliament in regard to temperance reform would go on, but we should not have run the risk of premature or hasty legislation. Again I say I think the postponement of the Bill would give time and opportunity for something with the same object, namely, the promotion of temperance, to be brought forward, but with a better prospect of success, and with the hearty good will instead of the doubt and opposition of the most earnest temperance workers of the country.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: I yield to none of your Lordships in my zeal for temperance reform, not even to the noble Viscount opposite o to the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London, and I admit that if I could accept all the figures that were given by the right rev. Prelate, I should feel myself compelled to accompany him into the Lobby in support of the noble Viscount opposite. But although I think that this Bill has not perhaps all the merits which have been claimed for it in the cause of temperance reform, at the same time I feel it my duty to vote for the Second Reading, and it will be impossible for me to go into the Lobby with the noble Viscount in support of an Amendment which is practically a courteous rejection of the Bill. I will not discuss how far intemperance may be cured by the reduction of licences, except to say that if you are going to do nothing else but reduce licences, without providing any machinery for a change of system, you will not make very great progress in the cause of temperance reform. I take it for granted that every one of your Lordships does wish as far as possible to reduce the number of licences. No one in this House has denied that a dislike to inflict injustice upon the licence-holders who will be dispossessed of their licences has, in a great many instances, caused magistrates to hold their hands in regard to a number of licences which, in the interests of the public, it would have been desirable to abolish. At present the magistrates have not only to consider the public interest, but also the injustice which they may be inflicting upon licence-holders. After the passing of this Bill magistrates will be able to consider the question solely from the point of view of the public interest. Looking back over the past history of this question, I think it is clear that public opinion in all quarters has gradually become more and more unanimous in support of compensation, in some form or another, being given.

What is the present position of licences in this country? Is it not altogether illogical and inconsistent? In the first place licences are regarded by the law as terminable every year; at the same time, in practice they have always been renewed. Moreover, they have been treated by the Inland Revenue authorities as a form of property which may well be taxed for death duties; and, more important than that, in cases where licences have not been renewed, in other words where they have been abolished in the interest of public improvements, compensation has been given. If I may use a phrase of the noble Viscount opposite, we have had the views of Prime Ministers, living and dead, belonging to both political Parties, in favour of compensation in some form or another, and we have had the Report both of the majority and of the minority of the Royal Commission over which the noble Viscount presided, urging that compensation should be given.

If it is admitted that although there is no legal claim to compensation at the same time without compensation you cannot have any temperance reform, the next question which arises is how that compensation is to be assessed. In this Bill it is laid down that the amount is to be fixed as the difference between the value of the house with a licence and the value of the house without a licence, that it is to be paid by the trade, and that it is to be assessed by the Revenue authorities —that is to say, the authorities will say to the licence-holder, "We value your premises at so much for the purpose of the death duties, and we will value them for compensation on precisely the same terms." The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition said that that was no argument whatever, because death duties were also paid upon houses, horses, pictures, and other property which had a market value, and that it was exactly the same with licences. Precisely so. But would the noble Earl be in favour of taking away that class of property without paying any compensation for it? I hold that compensation is not only necessary if a reduction of licences is to take place, but that the method of the assessment and distribution provided by this Bill is a just one.

I should like to comment for one moment upon the curious assertion of the noble Viscount who moved the Amendment that it was just to give compensation when you took away licences from hundreds of houses, but that it was not just when you took away a single licence. The noble Viscount shakes his head. I would remind the House that his chief criticism of this Bill was that, although compensation was given, there was no provision for a very large reduction of licences. The noble Viscount agrees, I think, with that interpretation of his speech. I presume that he would admit that if a large reduction of licences were to take place compensation would be justified. But surely the principle is precisely the same whether you take away the licences from a hundred houses or whether you take away the licence from one house. At any rate I cannot see any difference in principle between one and the other. Believing, then, that it is desirable that the number of public-houses should be reduced, and knowing that it is impossible, without compensation, that such a reduction should be carried out, I shall record my vote for this Bill, because for the first time this principle of compensation is admitted by an Act of Parliament.

I should like to say one word with regard to the limitations of this fund, because it has been urged by noble Lords opposite that this fund will be so limited as not to admit of a very large reduction of licences, and the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London quoted figures to prove that the number of licensed houses reduced under this Bill would be less rather than more than the number reduced previous to the passing of the Bill. It is very difficult to arrive at precise figures as to the number of houses that will be reduced under the Bill. All such calculations are more or less of the nature of speculation and prophecy. But I think the right rev. Prelate has made the mistake of assuming that the licences reduced under this Bill will be instead of, and not in addition to, those which would be reduced under existing circumstances. A great many of the licences taken away at the present time are licences which have not been renewed on the ground of misconduct or otherwise. Licences of that kind will be withheld after the passing of this Bill precisely as they were before. The passing of this Bill will have no effect whatever on the number of licences reduced by misconduct or otherwise.

With regard to the number of licences reduced merely on the ground of redundancy, it has been pointed out that those are very few at the present moment, and no one who has looked through the Returns given in the House of Commons of the sum of money which will be available in counties and county boroughs throughout the country can fail to realise that with the sum of £1,200,000 provided under this Bill, a very much larger number of houses will be capable of reduction than were reduced on the ground of redundancy before the passage of the measure. The Leader of the Opposition quoted the case of Liverpool, and said that a reduction in the number of houses had taken place there on a large scale. It was stated in the House of Commons by a member of the Government that seventy licences per annum would be reduced under this Bill, whereas up to the present moment the average has been only twenty-five per annum. I would point out, in further criticising the figures of the right rev. Prelate, that it is surely not fair to take the whole number of licensed houses in the country, find their average value, and to see how many times that average value will go into the sum of £1,200,000 in order to ascertain the number of licences that may be abolished under this Bill. It is obvious that after the passing of the Bill it will be the smaller, the less valuable, and the worse class houses that will first be reduced. It will be the ante-1869 beer-houses, the houses of inferior character and lower value, and therefore if you are to consider what will be the precise number of houses the licences of which may be taken away, you must go on the assumption that, at any rate for the first few years, it will be the smaller and the less valuable houses that will be dealt with. If it is clear that with this fund at their disposal quarter sessions will be able to reduce very considerably the number of licences in the country, how is it possible for it to be said, as the noble Viscount said yesterday, that this Bill will hinder the cause of temperance reform and prevent the reduction of redundant licences?

Now, my Lords, I come to another point in the Bill—the question of the ante-1869 beerhouses. These houses are admittedly the very worst in the country. They are the bad houses which the magistrates for many years have been anxious to get rid of, but have been unable to do so because of the impossibility of taking away their licences except on the ground of misconduct or other specified reasons. For the first time these houses will be brought under the control of the magistrates by the passing of this Bill.

Then I should like to say a word on the question of the time limit. It seems to me that there is a very great difference between a time limit to compensation and a time limit to licences. In speaking of the time limit these two different kinds of limit are very often confused. With regard to the former, it is surely quite illogical for those who are in favour of compensation, and of the system of compensation set up in this Bill, to be also in favour of a time limit in regard to it. Compensation is either a good thing or a bad thing. If it is a good thing, what can be the reason for putting a limit to the period under which you will give it? If you do that, at the end of the period, be it ten, fifteen, or twenty years, you will be back in precisely the same position as you are to-day, and the magistrates will have to consider, when they desire to refuse a licence, whether or not in doing so they will be inflicting an injustice upon the licence-holder. That is the question of a time limit for the compensation. The question of a time limit for licences is quite another matter. With the principle of a time limit for licences I am in entire agreement, and I shall have a word to say upon that in a moment.

But before dealing with that matter I would like to refer to Clause 4 of the Bill. I think that is an admirable clause. It is there laid down with regard to all new licences that their monopoly value shall in future go to the public to whom it belongs. In addition, the granting of licences is made dependent on certain conditions of a very valuable character. I cannot help feeling that if the provisions of this clause had been applicable to all existing houses, most of the evils which we deplore would have been cured, and there would have been no necessity for the very eloquent speeches by which this Amendment has been moved and supported. Are not all these matters so much to the good? Are they not all advances in the direction in which temperance reformers should go? The absence of compensation is admittedly at the present moment the greatest bar to the reduction of licensed houses. Very well; compensation is granted under the Bill, and that main bar to the reduction of licences is removed. Secondly, the ante-1869 beerhouses are admittedly a disgrace. At the present moment they cannot be touched, but by this Bill they will be brought under the control of the magistrates, and their licences may be taken away on payment of compensation.

All new licences after the passing of this Bill will be granted on a new and proper system. I would ask how a Bill which does these things can be called altogether reactionary and a bar to temperance reform?

I fully admit, my Lords, that there are things which ought to be done which are not done by this Bill, and that brings me to the criticisms which I have to make on the measure. It has been called a great temperance reform. The Prime Minister, in the other House, said it was the greatest temperance reform which had ever been introduced into or passed through Parliament. I cannot claim for it so high-sounding a title as that—not on account of what it does, but on account of what it leaves undone. No Bill is worthy of such a name as that which leaves the present system entirely as it is. The Prime Minister called that system illogical; it is worse than that. The present system is not merely illogical; it is degrading and demoralising to the nation. Under that system a great vested interest has grown up, the pressure of which is felt throughout the country and even in Parliament itself.

With the indulgence of your Lordships, I will point out very briefly what some of the evils of the present system are. In the first place, the State, by granting a licence to an individual at a perfectly nominal sum, immediately confers an enormous and perfectly fictitious value upon the house to which the licence is attached. For this privilege the State gets no adequate return whatsoever. Here I venture to say is a huge source of wealth for the purpose of revenue at present absolutely untouched. Secondly, there is the utterly mischievous system of tied houses, representing 75 or 80 per cent. of the public-houses of the country. I say that this system of tied houses ought to be done away with, but it will not be touched by this Bill. Thirdly, there is no public control over the management of public-houses. I think it is a fact that the interests of a publican in pushing the sale of intoxicating liquor, and the general management of the premises of which he is the owner or is in charge, has much more influence on the question of intemperance than the mere existence of a house in which intoxicating liquor is sold. Finally, I hold that under the present system there is no opportunity for experiment in temperance reform on a large scale. I am one of those who are very largely in sympathy with the system presided over by Lord Grey, namely, the trust system, but I hold that that system has no opportunity of really being put to the test so long as there are only a few of these trust houses, dotted all over the country, and swamped, it may be, by houses held on a totally different principle. Not until you can get an experiment carried out in a restricted area and on a large scale will you have any opportunity of seeing how far that is really a reform in the direction of temperance.

I hold that all these are evils which the Bill leaves practically untouched. But it may be said: How are you going to remedy those evils? I consider that the first essential of any comprehensive scheme of temperance reform is to get rid of the present system. This can only be done, not by the reduction of licences here and there, but by the extinction of all licences held under the present system, and the substitution of licences held under a totally different system. I conceive that this could be done by a system of time-limited licences, which I say is a very different thing to a time-limited compensation. If you were to guarantee all existing licences for a certain period, and to say that at the end of that period all licences would lapse, that would be machinery by which you could change from one system to another. All new licences within that period might be granted either on the improved system of Clause 4, or under any other system which it might be desirable to institute, but all new licences during that period should be granted under that system, and then at the end of the period every licence in the country would be under that system. It would be desirable for the State—the central authority—to lay down as a principle the number of public-houses which would be allowed in proportion to the population throughout the country, leaving to the local authorities, the magistrates, or quarter sessions, the decision as to where precisely those houses should be put in each locality.

Personally, I should have much preferred a system of that sort to the one embodied in the Bill. I would remind your Lordships that a system of that sort was suggested some years ago—a sufficient number of years ago to have enabled us to-day, had it been then passed, to have obtained control of all licences and to have started a perfectly new system. That Bill, however, was objected to by temperance reformers, and it was never carried into law. I believe also that some machinery of that sort was what the most rev. Primate had in his mind when he suggested the Amendment which he read to the House yesterday. I believe it was with the object of getting rid of the present system, and instituting a new system, that he suggested a time limit in the form embodied in his Amendment. I have not yet sufficiently considered the actual wording of the Amendment to know whether I shall be able to support it or not; but from what I gathered when I heard him read it out, I should say that his plan will not really accomplish the object he has in view—at any rate with justice to all concerned. It appears to me that the essence of any time limit for licences is that during the period of the limit the licences should be guaranteed, otherwise there is no compensation involved. You cannot ask men to pay insurance for a certain number of years against any possible loss within that period, with the certainty that they will lose both their insurance and their property at the end of the period. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London said that if this Amendment were carried you would be giving compensation during the fourteen years. But the State will not be giving any compensation, it would be merely asking the licence-holders to insure themselves, which is a very different thing. I admit that, provided the compensation was paid out of public funds during the period of fourteen years, and that at the end of that period the licence should cease, that would be a very different matter. However, I will reserve my final decision upon that point until we get into Committee. But I would say this: it cannot be done in the manner proposed by the most rev. Primate in his Amendment to the Bill.

I see nothing whatever in the Bill as it stands to prevent any such system as I have suggested from being carried out in some other Bill at some other time. There is nothing in the Bill as it stands to hinder a larger and more comprehensive scheme of temperance reform in the future, and I feel sure that noble Lords opposite, who have claimed for themselves a greater sympathy in the cause of temperance reform, will see that, when their time comes, some measure of a more comprehensive character is brought in. I feel sure, after the speeches which they have delivered in this House to-day, assisted by the right rev. Prelates on the Episcopal Bench, they will not be content to let this question rest as it will be left by the passing of this Bill. They will not rest until some comprehensive measure is introduced, which will one day put an end once and for all to the present system, which is universally condemned, and which is responsible, I think, for one of the greatest social evils of the present day.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, at this advancing hour of the night, I do not propose to detain your Lordships at any length by following the close and able analysis of many of the provisions of this Bill which has been undertaken, both by some of my noble friends behind me and by some critics on the other side of the House. Nor shall I follow in detail the points raised by the noble Earl who has just sat down. The noble Earl told us that he intends to support the Second Reading of the Bill, but I am bound to say that on the greater part of his speech we on this side of the House are inclined to claim him as a supporter. He seemed to me to throw a great deal more verve and enthusiasm into his critical statements with regard to the Bill than into the accents of approval and faint praise with which he began his speech. All I propose to do is to recall one or two points that occur to me as having arisen in the course of the debate. The noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, at the beginning of his speech yesterday, warned the noble Viscount who moved the Amendment and the entire Episcopal Bench against the danger of too much earnestness. Speaking to them in almost paternal tones, he seemed to think that if they were over earnest in this matter, they might be led into inflicting injustice upon those who hold proprietary rights in these licences. I can say at once that, so far as His Majesty's Government are concerned, we absolve them from any over earnestness in this matter.

What was the conduct of the measure in the other House? It is true that at the conclusion of the proceedings in that House, the Prime Minister spoke of the Bill as a great measure of temperance reform, but he seemed to invest the whole subject with that atmosphere of agreeable triviality with which he is able to surround any subject the discussion of which he desires to curtail. Now that the measure has come to this House, it does not seem to me to have been dealt with in a very serious spirit. Before I leave this part of the subject, I should like to draw attention to the statement of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack with reference to the manner in which this measure was dealt with in another place. He stated—if not in so many words, he certainly implied—that the fact that the measure had not received due discussion in another place was owing to waste of time—I do not think he used the word "obstruction"—on the part of the Opposition. What warrant has the noble and learned Lord for that statement? I followed the debates in another place with considerable care, but I do not recall that either the Home Secretary or the Solicitor-General complained in any way of the conduct of the Opposition during the course of the discussions; and I shall be very greatly surprised if the noble Marquess who leads this House brings any charge of obstruction against the Opposition in another place.

I said that this question had not been, in my opinion, very seriously dealt with, but I suppose we shall all agree that it is a serious question. My noble friend Lord Spencer made some mention of the facts which cause all serious people, and all people who are connected with the administration of justice, to look upon this drink question as one of the gravest social problems. I might call attention to another reminder which has appeared within the last few days, namely, the Report of the Committee on Physical Deterioration. I do not know whether many of your Lordships have had time to read that Report, but under the heading of "Alcoholism" there are a series of exceedingly striking facts dealing with this question. One witness stated that at one school in south-east London, at which upwards of 200 children attended, there were only twelve whose parents were not given to what was politely called "irregular use of alcohol." There were other lamentable statistics about the increase of drinking among women in certain parts of England. That, after all, is rather a new aspect of the question, We have been accustomed to recognise the gravity of the drink question in relation to crime, lunacy, and failures, but we have not to a full extent regarded it, as it is now regarded, in its effect upon generations to come. It may be said that these matters are well known to everybody, that they are mere platitudes. But if these evils are platitudes, how is it that there is not more recognition of them in the Government Bill, and in the speeches by which that Bill is supported? Throughout the speeches which noble Lords have delivered, and in particular the speech of the noble Marquess who is, I think, the Cabinet Minister in charge of the Bill, and whose speech therefore must be regarded as the central feature of this debate, there was a great deal of recognition of the rights of the man who sells drink but very little allusion to his responsibilities. I could hardly trace in the speech of the noble Marquess that he recognised from a social point of view any difference whatever between the man who sells boots and the man who sells gin.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I do not know whether the noble Earl is implying that I do not feel, and that I did not express, sympathy with all that has been said with reference to the great evils of intemperance, but I began my speech with, I am afraid, rather too long a passage dealing with that very point.

***The Earl of CREWE**: I am in the recollection of the House, and unless we were to have the good fortune of hearing the whole of the noble Marquess's speech over again, it would be difficult to prove or to disprove what I said; but certainly it did seem to me that the main burden of his speech—perhaps necessarily, as he was replying to the noble Viscount—dealt rather with the responsibility of the public towards the publican than of the publican towards the public. After all, it seems to me that so far as this debate is concerned, there is a deep-seated and possibly an ineradicable difference of view on the claim of licence-holders to compensation. I do not in the least mean as regard the law on the matter, because on that my noble friend behind me, Lord Davey, and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack are practically agreed. Nor do I mean that there is any difference in any part of the House, so far as I know, as to the desirability of giving compensation in some form or other to dispossessed licence-holders. But as to the nature of the claim of the dispossessed licence-holder, and the scope of the privileges which he ought to possess, there does seem to be a deep-rooted division of opinion which will be before long exemplified in the Lobbies into which we respectively walk. Of course, if a licence is distinctly a property, the whole question falls to the ground; but, if it is to be regarded as a matter of reasonable expectation, the question of the nature and scope of the compensation has to be considered.

The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack made what I venture to think was an illuminating comparison, when he reminded the House of a certain analogy between the position of licence-holders and the position of farm tenants who hold from year to year. I have heard it said, not in this House, but outside, "You are a nice sort of people, to wish, to deprive licence-holders of their compensation! Why, in your Irish land legislation you translated what was merely an expectation into a valuable monetary possession. Up to the time of your Land Act of 1881 the Irish tenant outside Ulster was liable to be dispossessed, and yet you came down and presented him with compensation." That is no doubt what we did, but is the case of the Irish tenant at all analagous with that of the holder of a public-house licence? The Irish tenant—at least this was the reason offered for the Bill, though some noble Lords may dispute the fact—was to receive compensation because the enhanced value of his holding was due to something that he had done. But can that be said in any sense of the licence-holder? The enhanced value of his house over and above its value as a dwelling-house is due to nothing that he has done, but simply to the fact that a monopoly has been presented to him by the State. But it does seem to me that there is a very distinct analogy between the position of a year-to-year tenant in England and that of a licence-holder. It is perfectly true, as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack stated, that where a tenant or his family has been in possession, as is doubtless the case on many of the estates owned by your Lordships, for many years, and in some cases for hundreds of years, you would be exceedingly unwilling to dispossess him without consideration. But I will ask anybody who is used to land-owning whether, in the case of a year-to-year tenant being dispossessed by his landlord, say in order to turn his holding into building land, or for planting, or for some other purpose of the landlord, he would suggest that that tenant should be given the amount of compensation which by this Bill is proposed to be given to licence-holders? Would you give even the amount of compensation which is proposed to be given by the Amendment of the most rev. Primate? Would you be prepared, that is to say, to give the man all the profits of his holding for fourteen years and the equivalent of a seven years tenure in addition? No landlord, however generous, would take such a course as that, and I cannot help feeling that the noble and learned Lord, in introducing this analogy, has been treading on somewhat dangerous ground, which was carefully avoided by noble Lords on the Front Bench, some of whom perhaps have more intimate knowledge of the proceedings of landowners than the noble and learned Lord himself.

What is the conclusion that is to be drawn from the kind of claim which the licence-holder possesses? One conclusion, to my mind, is that there should be a very wide discretion in applying that compensation in different degrees to different cases. There are cases in which, as it seems to me, very full and handsome compensation ought to be given; but there are other cases, such as were mentioned by the noble Viscount yesterday, where all the houses in one area belong to one firm of brewers, and where a reduction of the number of licences would mean no pecuniary loss to the owner at all—in such cases surely, in common fairness, the compensation ought to be small. That is to say, it ought to be estimated not on the supposed value of the licence, but as a kind of compassionate allowance assessed on the moral merits of the case.

I now pass to another point, a small one, but having some value. It is the case that you are undoubtedly adding to the value of the holding of the licensee, and you are unquestionably giving him something which he had not before. Will not that have some effect on the action of licensing benches in the matter of removals for misconduct? When a man is now removed for misconduct, which may be of a more or less gross character, what he loses is his house under the conditions described in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield." If you dispossess him under this Bill you deprive him not merely of his licence, but also of the pecuniary compensation which he would have received if he had been removed under ordinary circumstances. The conclusion that I draw is that the licensing benches, being kindly folk, will be more easy-going in cases of minor misconduct and less inclined to clear out a man than they would be if the operation of the law remained as at present.

I will deal with one point to which the noble Earl who spoke last alluded. He implied that this Bill had many shortcomings, and I gathered that if the noble Earl had had the making of it it would be quite unrecognisable. Following pretty closely the words of the Prime Minister in a letter which can be read in the newspapers of to-day, he said that all this is not a final measure, that it will be quite possible for some succeeding Government, to whichever Party it belongs, to amend this legislation in any way it pleases. That statement of the Prime Minister, as I read it this morning, seemed to be one of those ingenious arguments, most effective of their kind, which, when you read them in one way, are truisms, and when you read them in another way are the reverse of true. It is perfectly true that Parliament can undo anything that has been done by Parliament. Parliament could undo the whole of the Irish land legislation of last year if it chose, but we know it is not likely to do anything of the kind.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: I never suggested that anything should be undone.

THE EARL OF CREWE: No, I do not say that the noble Earl did, but I think the Prime Minister in his letter certainly went so far as to imply that this legislation could be amended in any way that Parliament chose to suggest at a future time. That is the truism—that Parliament could alter anything. But, on the other hand, it surely is the fact that it is a very difficult matter to deal, after any reasonable distance of time, with a measure which has received the sanction of Parliament as this measure will probably receive that sanction in its present form. Some of the noble Lords behind me have spoken of the vast interests involved in the brewing industry. Upwards of ninety millions of shares are quoted on the Stock Exchange and held by investors all over the country. You have these interests to attack or at any rate to deal with and to proceed against when the whole matter comes to be re-opened.

In addition to that, it seems to me that by carrying this present legislation you are finally stereotyping the whole cast of drink-sellers in the country. You are making it infinitely more difficult to adopt methods, either of municipal management or of private trust management, such as those with which my noble friend Earl Grey is so closely connected. Once you have stated, as you are stating by this Bill, that the licence-holder is a man who must under no circumstances be dispossessed without being compensated, it stands to reason that you make his position infinitely stronger, and that to replace him by any means by a different person entrusted with the sale of intoxicating liquor becomes more and more difficult. I know that Lord Grey did not take this view. He stated that in his belief the passing of this Bill would assist the cause which he has so much at heart. I wish it were so, but it does seem to me that my noble friend, who, as we know, is of a sanguine disposition, takes too confident a view of the possibilities of this measure. He seems to consider that, whenever he comes forward as a representative of a trust to try and purchase a licence, that he will be able to get that licence from quarter sessions. He quoted the case of a village in which there were two public-houses, one a trust house and the other a free house, or more likely a tied house, and he stated his belief that if this measure were to pass his trust would be easily able to step into possession of the other house, having announced beforehand that they would close the house on pay nights, and knock off the sale of spirits on occasions when the house was likely to be crowded. I know nothing about quarter sessions in the noble Earl's county, but it seems to me that they are exceedingly unlikely to do anything of the kind. Why should they dispossess the other licence-holder if the house were perfectly well conducted? I can conceive it possible that magistrates of a small district, all clubbed together to support the noble Earl's trust system, might be got to do such a thing, but to tell me that the licensing committee of a county like Northumberland would do what is essentially a somewhat arbitrary act seems to me a singularly improbable and Utopian belief on the part of my noble friend.

In conclusion, I would merely say that it does seem to me—and this is my great reason for supporting the Amendment of my noble friend—that this Bill, if carried into law, will, to a great extent, close the door against other experiments in temperance reform. Temperance reform we all agree must be, to a great extent, a matter of experiment. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack does not much believe, I gather, in this particular experiment. I think he said that he did not believe that to diminish the number of licences would necessarily diminish the extent of drinking. If he holds that view I almost wonder he is found supporting this Bill. But, however that may be, it is the fact that all temperance legislation must be of a somewhat experimental character, and our great objection to this measure is that it does not, in our opinion, leave that room for experiment which we desire. We regard it as a stereotyping measure, and for that reason we propose to support the Amendment moved by the noble Viscount.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD: My Lords, having listened with much interest to a great many of the speeches in favour of the Bill, and having read a great many more speeches, I have still to confess myself one of the objectors to it. My only difficulty, after listening to all that has been said on behalf of the Bill, is to know how to select the objections to which I desire to draw attention, but the course is made easier by the fact that the one objection which has been brought before the House by the noble Viscount in his Amendment is so forcible as to make almost all other objections superfluous. I take it that it is on that ground that so many of those on the Benches immediately around me, though naturally inclined to favour many things in the Bill, feel compelled to vote with the noble Viscount on this occasion. I venture to think that we do so because we live a great part of our life outside the highly refracting atmosphere of political Parties and approach this subject, therefore, simply from the point of view of what the Prime Minister called natural equity and the welfare of the masses of the people.

When we consider the Bill in this way, concentrating our attention on the noble Viscount's objection to it as set forth in the Amendment, for my own part I am led to this conclusion, that the Bill bestows a new title upon the trade. I think I heard one noble Lord on the Government Bench say that it did not bestow a new title, but surely the method of compensation proposed in the Bill as it stands converts an expectation, whatever that expectation may be worth, into a secure and perpetual vested interest, and if that does not constitute a new title, I am altogether unable to say what would do so. Seeing that this is the effect of the proposed method of compensation, I think we may fairly describe the Bill as amounting to a very wasteful, and, in fact, an amazing gift to the drink trade. I ask myself the question, which I am not able to answer, What has this drink trade done to deserve this highly-favoured and exceptional treatment? I do not believe there is any answer to this question. It is impossible when we approach this question, not as an academic question but as a question of practical politics, not to bear in mind that the present House of Commons has received no mandate to make this enormous gift to a particular trade; and I venture to express a doubt whether His Majesty's Government would dare to go to the country to get a mandate on the subject.

I am well aware that the Bill receives very different descriptions from different persons, that persons who approach it from different sides and look at different aspects of it give entirely contradictory descriptions of it. I hold in my hand a remarkable book which has lately been published on this Bill by two of the most dispassionate students of the drink question that we can find—Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Sherwell. I have no idea what their position is in ordinary politics; I think of them merely as dispassionate students of the drink question. The authors of this book claim to have examined the Bill in no narrow partisan spirit, recognising the urgency and grave national importance of the question it deals with; and the conclusion they arrive at is—and it is stated in words stronger than I myself would have ventured to use—that the public will not be a penny the better off for it. I think the figures quoted by my right rev. brother the Bishop of London and by one or two other speakers support that assertion. Indeed, say Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell, the nation will be in a far worse position in being deprived of the prospective source of national revenue which will be handed over as a reckless gift to the liquor trade; and they declare the proposals in the Bill so utterly indefensible that it seems incredible that they should have been embodied in a Government Bill.

I turn from these two students of the question to the Prime Minister, whose description of the Bill is that it is the "best measure of temperance reform that has ever passed the House." I take it that this description was quite seriously meant by the Prime Minister. He, no doubt, meant it as sincerely as I do the words I am uttering. It occurred it is true, in a peroration, when sometimes the imagination takes a flight, but I accept it as seriously meant. In face of these contradictory descriptions I inquire into the genesis of the Bill. Who assisted at the birth of the Bill? The brewers! Who have been the most earnest promoters of the Bill in the other House? The brewers! By whose critical votes in one division after another have the provisions of this Bill been sent up to this House? Again, by the brewers! And who are the most whole-hearted supporters—indeed, I might almost say the only whole-hearted supporters—of the Bill in the country? Again I have to say, the brewers!

I confess I am filled with amazement when I hear the argument adduced that this is the greatest measure of temperance reform that has ever passed through the House of Commons. I cannot accept it as such in any real sense, and personally I should be quite content to leave it to be settled by the people in the constituencies when they re-enter into their constitutional rights on this and other social questions. Still we are face to face with the remarkable fact that whole classes of people conscientiously take such different views on the measure. We have Members on both sides equally in earnest, equally convinced that they are right and that others are wrong. It is a strange and curious circumstance. I do not know that I have ever seen such a direct antithesis of opinion in the course of my attention to public affairs. I may be entirely wrong, but I am brought to this conclusion in the matter, that some of us approach the question simply from what I may call the moral point of view, while others, from the habits and the circumstances of their lives, especially those who are engaged in Parliamentary life, approach the question mainly from the point of view of property. This, I take it, is what mainly accounts for the present trend of opinion in this House. Here we have the whole Bench of Bishops sympathising with the noble Viscount and ready to support his Amendment; we have the whole of the occupants of the Government Bench supporting the Bill and equally convinced that they are right.

Let me turn for the moment to consider one or two of the moral aspects of the question—the aspects that specially concern us whose business is more directly with the life of the people. In this regard I hold that the Bill errs both in the way of excess and of defect. We all of us feel that our first duty in any act of legislation is to be just. Legislation which is not based on justice is worthless legislation, if it is not mischievous. Looking at the matter from this point of view, I repeat that the Bill errs both in the way of excess and defect. It gives too much to the brewer, too little to the *bona fide* publican as distinct from the brewer, and nothing at all to the public. I dare say many of your Lordships are familiar with the phrase in which Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, who has also given a good deal of study to this question, summed up this Bill. He said, in an epigram not to be forgotten and more true than many epigrams, that this Bill puts the brewer on the bench, puts the justices in the dock, and puts the public out of Court.

I venture to repeat that the Bill gives too much to the brewer and too little to the publican. I notice that in many instances the publican will get not more than one year's compensation at the best. I take it most of us will agree that that is too little. I observe, in travelling about my diocese, that publicans are beginning to realise that they have been foolish Esaus and have sold their birthright of freedom to their more powerful brothers, the brewers, for a mess of pottage. I notice that this legislation—this great boon to the brewer—is beginning to raise in opposition a body of publicans who are not so closely allied to the brewer as is thought. There is undoubtedly a rift in the lute, and I think it is a growing rift.

I object to a perpetual endowment of a trade already unduly favoured and the less deserving of exceptional treatment because of late it has become a highly speculative trade. In my own city of Hereford at the time of the decision in the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" most of the publicans owned their own houses, but in the interval which has elapsed they have nearly all been bought up by one company after another. One great company, over-capitalised and very speculative, bought up I do not know how many of our free houses, some of them not houses of the first repute or of any particular value, and proceeded to rebuild several of them. When I asked the other day how they were prospering I found that this great company had sold all these houses but one to another company, and my fellow-citizens tell me that this trade has been going on just as if these houses had been shares in a South African mine. These companies came into Hereford after the decision in the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield," and therefore knew the conditions under which they were purchasing. In the book which I have in my hand and to which I have already referred, there is a very striking illustration of the speculative character of this trade of late years. We are here told that three separate companies, the aggregate value of whose properties a few months prior to amalgamation was £3,389,000, suddenly amalgamated and then valued their properties at £8,593,000—an increase of over £5,000,000. Surely the claims for compensation will have to be very carefully considered if no more than justice is to be done. Of the 380 brewing companies which are mentioned in one of the official books on the subject, there were only fourteen in existence in 1883 and there were only forty-four in existence at the time when the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield," came up but, as I have said, there are now 380, and the money of these companies has been invested with full knowledge of the state of the law in this matter.

There is another reason why some of us are very much opposed to the perpetual endowment of this trade. I venture to think that if your Lordships could see the various gin palaces which I pass on my way to and from this House, if you could realise, as I realise day by day, the mischief they are doing to an indefinite number of people, if you could see the wreckage, as I see it, I venture to say you would not think so much of property, and more about the moral aspect of the question. At any rate, that is the effect which these sights have on my mind. In conclusion I desire to add one word of comment on some of the arguments so persistenly repeated. We were told at the outset that if the magistrates continued to act in the way they had been acting no persons of substance would be likely to engage in the trade, but now we are told that magistrates will not suppress licences because they cannot give compensation. I venture to think that these arguments are mutually destructive

Again the supporters of the Bill are never tired of repeating the fallacy that the proposed compensation will come out of the pocket of the publican, and the public will not pay a penny of it. But surely when this Bill becomes law, what the trade will have to pay will be as much a public tax as any other tax—only it will be ear-marked for a particular purpose; and there is no real common sense in saying that it comes out of the pockets of the trade, and not out of the pockets of the taxpaying public, because that argument goes entirely on the assumption that there is some sort of law of the Medes and Persians that you must not increase the duties which are being paid by the trade. I hope that amongst the things we shall see in the future will be the re-entering of the taxpaying public into the value of what is its own property, and from the possession of which it has been kept too long. I venture to hope that the Amendment will meet with a predominant amount of support in your Lordships' House, because I desire that the Bill may be so modified as not to block the way to all good temperance reform in the future. If the Bill becomes law in its present shape it will lock the door to progressive temperance reform and put the key in the pocket of the brewers.

The Lord Bishop of Hereford.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, the lateness of the hour and the conditions of the temperature render me reluctant to occupy your Lordships' time for more than a very few minutes. I am also painfully conscious of the fact that the arguments which can be produced in support of, or in opposition to, this measure are limited in number, and that most of these arguments have been already freely used during the course of this debate, and I have not observed that either side has been deterred from producing their own arguments by the reflection that those arguments have already been demolished by their opponents.

This discussion has brought into relief certain points of difference, and it has also shown that up to a certain point there is a considerable amount of agreement on both sides of the House. To begin with, I believe, we are all in favour of a measure calculated to promote the cause of temperance, and although the proposals of the Government may not go so far as noble Lords opposite would wish, they will, I an convinced, give us credit for a sincere desire to subserve this great cause. Again, I gather from the speeches delivered that we all believe that a reduction in the number of licences is a step in the direction of temperance: that we all desire to see the process of reducing redundant licences accelerated by one means or another: and, so far as I have been able to observe the general feeling of the House, I assume that all of us hold that where a licensee is deprived of his licence, not for misconduct, but solely as a matter of public policy, he is entitled to some consideration, in respect of that of which he is deprived. Those are, in effect, the proposals on which the Bill is founded, and I am almost tempted to say that this discussion has a certain unreality about it, because I believe those principles are not disputed on the other side of the House.

It is complained that the process of reducing licences under this Bill will be too gradual, and, further, that the terms upon which it is proposed to get rid of them are too favourable to the licensees. With regard to the slow rate of reduction, the figures which were produced at the outset of the debate by my noble friend behind me still hold the field. My noble friend was able to tell your Lordships that, under this Bill, a sum of, in round figures, £1,250,000 would be annually available for this purpose, and that with that expenditure there was a prospect of getting rid annually of something between 1,500 licences and 2,000 licences, instead of the few hundred licences which we have hitherto been successful in getting rid of. Surely no one will contend that that is a negligible contribution. We have to-night listened to an eloquent speech from the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London, but I was quite unable to follow the figures in which the right rev. Prelate attempted to show that, so far as the city of London was concerned, this Bill would produce little or no effect. I understand that under this Bill £250,000 a year will be available for the purpose of extinguishing redundant licences in London, and that is a sum which obviously must produce a certain effect. It has to be remembered that the results of this expenditure will be in addition to the extinction of licences which is already in progress owing to the misconduct or bad behaviour of the licensees.

The real crux of the question, I suppose, is the basis upon which the compensation of the licensee is to be determined. I listened with great attention to what fell from the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition upon this question. The noble Earl was torn in two directions. He is by nature a just man, and he evidently desired to do justice to the class which will be affected by this legislation. On the other hand, throughout his observations there was perceptible a very distinct desire to get his hand into the pocket of the publican, and the noble Earl was apparently in some difficulty in determining which of these two opposing influences should prevail. He eventually got rid of the difficulty by making a very considerable admission; he told your Lordships that in his opinion these licence-holders were entitled to something when their licences were held to be redundant, and after mentioning several of the expressions which had been used to describe that something which the licensee was to receive, he proposed the word "indemnity" as a suitable description of what he intended. Now, the word "indemnity" is a far-reaching and significant word; I sought for a definition, and I find that what it means is—

"An undertaking or contract to make good to another a loss, or to protect him against liability."

If, then, the noble Earl is prepared to give an indemnity to these licensees, I feel sure it will convey very great comfort to them. If I were a brewer I should ask for no more favourable terms.

*EARL SPENCER: Not in perpetuity.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am coming to the question of perpetuity. While, however, the noble Earl was prepared to give the licensees an indemnity, he went on to object to allowing them to receive even the product of the insurance which they are to contribute out of their own pockets under this measure. He described it as a large gift. What a complete misapprehension that denotes! It is not a gift, large or small; it is a contribution which members of this trade are to provide out of their own pockets. Then the noble Earl told us we were creating a perpetuity. Sometimes it is a perpetuity, sometimes it is a freehold, sometimes it is an endowment. I do not very much care by what name you call it. The essential fact remains that these people have an interest which can be and has been expressed in terms of money. It is an interest which has passed from one man to another by inheritance, which has been sold by one man to another, and for which high compensation has been paid whenever the premises of the licence-holder have, for any public purpose, been disturbed. If that is so, and if you are to give the licence-holder whom you dispossess an indemnity, then I say that is our case, that is all we ask your Lordships to agree to in this Bill.

My noble friend Lord Crewe followed the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack into an analogy which the noble and learned Lord had used. But my noble friend Lord Crewe changed the venue, and spoke of the treatment which had been accorded by the Legislature to the Irish tenants. Now, my Lords, I venture to suggest that there is a somewhat remarkable similarity between the case of the Irish tenants and the case of these licence-holders. The licence-holders have spent money in equipping their premises for a particular purpose, and if you turn them out of those premises and compel the premises to be used for some other purpose, you admit that some compensation is due. That is very much the ground upon which the Legislature determined that compensation should be paid to the Irish tenants for their improvements. They had spent money on improving their holdings, and I think up to that point we are all of us quite ready to admit that they were entitled to compensation. But there is another reason for which we consider that these licensees are entitled to consideration. They have been given a monopoly value of their premises. The right rev. Prelate who spoke last asked what the trade had done in order to entitle them to such a recognition. My Lords, it is not what the trade has done. It is our action, the action of Parliament, the action of the magistrates, which has given these people what we speak of as the monopoly value of their premises, and in exactly the same way the Irish tenants obtained what I think Mr. Gladstone called the "*pretium affectionis*" of their holdings; that is, the monopoly value of the limited quantity of land available for cultivation in Ireland.

Now I come back to the interests of these licensees. Let us bear in mind that that interest is not one which is moribund or which dwindles with every year that passes. Whether you deprive the licensee of his licence this year or five years or ten years hence, his claim is the same. He has the same interest in his premises and the same right to be reasonably dealt with. That interest will certainly not have diminished during the interval, if during that interval you have been compelling him to put his hand into his own pocket and to contribute to an insurance fund out of which the members of the trade have received compensation.

I will not go at length at this hour into the question of the time limit, about which I have no doubt we shall hear a great deal in Committee. But I willingly concede this to the noble Lords who advocate a time limit—that its imposition would be one very obvious way of dealing with the question of compensation. If, however, you proceed by means of a time limit you must logically, while that time limit operates, give the tenant of the premises something like absolute security that he will not be interfered with. You must say to him, in fact, "We give you fourteen years certain tenure of your premises. Now make hay while the sun shines, and out of your profits you will be able to accumulate a reserve fund which will provide a reasonable indemnity when the time limit comes to an end." I do not know whether the advocates of temperance would have been very grateful to us if we had proposed a postponement of all interference with the licensee such as I have suggested, nor do I know how, if we were to proceed in that manner, when the time limit expired, you would make your selection between those licence-holders whom you proposed to get rid of and those who were to be left in the possession of their premises. But the idea of a time limit is inconsistent with the principle of this Bill. A time limit assumes that during the continuance of the time limit the licence-holder will enjoy a certain amount of immunity, but what kind of immunity would it be if, while the interval of time was running, you were all the while taking out of the pocket of the licensee the benevolences which will be exacted from him under this Bill as contributions to an insurance fund?

I wish to say one word with regard to the manner in which this Bill affects the magistrates. We have been told that the effect of the measure will be to oust the magistrates from a position which they have filled with success, and which they desire to retain. Is it really true that this Bill to any material extent deprives the magistrates of the power which they have hitherto enjoyed? I venture to maintain that if you make a sort of debit and credit account of that which the Bill takes away from the magistrates and that which it gives to them, you will find that, far from depriving the magistrates of their privileges, this Bill really increases their authority, and gives them opportunities of using their influence which they have not hitherto enjoyed. So far as the withdrawal of licences for misconduct is concerned, the power of the magistrates in brewster sessions remains unchanged. That to my mind disposes of some of the rather ill-considered statements to which I have listened during this debate to the effect that the Bill robs the magistrates of their disciplinary functions. That is not the case.

But when you come to the withdrawal of licences on the ground of redundancy, is it the case that the position of the magistrates is really impaired? Under the present law the brewster sessions refuse the renewal of licences and the licensees have an appeal to quarter sessions. Under this Bill the brewster sessions make a recommendation to the quarter sessions, and the quarter sessions decide, with the advice, no doubt, of the magistrates representing the local bench. It seems to me that the distinction between the treatment of licences refused for redundancy and of licences refused for misconduct is an eminently sound one, because when a local bench refuses licences on the ground of misconduct, the question which is to be determined is one of local fact, with which the local magistrates are eminently competent to deal; but when you come to withdraw a licence on the ground of redundancy, you at once enter into a larger question of policy, which quarter sessions are far better able to deal with. Moreover, for the purpose of compensation the smaller area would be altogether inappropriate.

But if in any of these points we have taken something away from the magistrates, this Bill is full of additions to the authority of the magistrates. Under this Bill magistrates are given for the first time the power of dealing with the ante-1869 beerhouses—33,000 altogether, or one-third of the whole number. Then in the county boroughs we have transferred the jurisdiction from the quarter sessions to the local magistrates, and I believe that is a concession which is greatly appreciated by the magistrates belonging to the benches of these county boroughs; and, again, as to the non-county boroughs we associate with the quarter sessions magistrates belonging to the borough bench. Then, in addition to that, there are the very considerable powers granted to the magistrates in Clause 4 of the Bill, powers the addition of which have, I think, been welcomed by noble Lords opposite as well as on this side of the House. And, lastly, I must refer to one minor point which I do not think has been alluded to during the course of the debate—that is, the opportunity which is afforded to the magistrates under Clause 8 of the Bill. I do not know whether your Lordships have observed that under that clause it is provided that the magistrates may receive from a licensee a reasonable undertaking—I presume with regard to the alteration of the premises or their management—and that if such reasonable undertaking is received on the grant or renewal of a licence and the licensee fails to fulfil if, thereupon the justices may refuse the licence as if the licensee had been guilty of misconduct. That, it seems to me, gives to the magistrates an opportunity of, so to speak, establishing a hold upon these licensed premises which they have hitherto not been able to obtain. On the whole, therefore, I say that under the Bill magistrates, far from being ousted from their powers, really come out with very considerably enhanced and augmented powers.

I venture to think that the main counts in the indictment against this Bill have not been made good. It has not been proved that any perpetuity or endowment will be given to the trade, or that any interest is recognised which the trade does not now possess. It is wholly incorrect to say that there is anything whatever in the Bill to close the door against any larger scheme of reform should it hereafter be the desire of the Legislature that such a scheme should be introduced. My noble friend, Lord Grey, who may be regarded as knowing something of the scheme with which he is so honourably identified, told your Lordships that, in his opinion, there is nothing in the Bill to prevent the adoption of his scheme, and what he said is equally true of any wider, more extensive, and far-reaching scheme that may hereafter be devised. When I heard the right rev. Prelate who has just spoken tell the House that the proposals in the Bill originated with the brewers, and that to the best of his belief none but brewers were in favour of it, I felt that the right rev. Prelate was allowing his strong feelings in regard to the liquor trade to grievously distort his judgment. Not only has the Bill been supported by those whose interest in the cause of temperance is beyond suspicion, but the House has been told by Lord Cross that at the meeting of the Association of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, a body of men whose authority in regard to these questions is certainly unrivalled, there was only one voice raised in opposition to the Bill. Although the Bill may not be as imposing a measure as some noble Lords opposite desire, it is, nevertheless, a substantial step towards a diminution in the number of licences, which all who have given consideration to the question, from the Royal Commission presided over by the noble Viscount downwards, have regarded as an indispensable preliminary to any progress in temperance reform.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion." Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 142; Not-Contents, 47.

CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Argyll, D.
Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Richmond, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Abergavenny, M.
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Cholmondeley, M.
Exeter, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)

Ancaster, E.
Bathurst, E.
Cadogan, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnwath, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chichester, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Derby, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Drogheda, E.
Eldon, E.
Feversham, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Grey, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Howe, E.
Kilmorey, E.
Lathom, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Londesborough, E.
Lucan, E.
Lytton, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mayo, E.

Morton, E.
Onslow, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Scarbrough, E.
Selborne, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Waldegave, E. [*Teller.*]
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Falmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Amhurst of Hackney, L.
Armstrong, L.

Ashbourne, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Biddulph, L.
Bolton, L.
Broderick, L. (*V. Midleton*).)
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Cheylesmore, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Digby, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Dunmore, L. (*E. Dunmore.*)
Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)

Forester, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Glanusk, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L.
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hylton, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Methuen, L.
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Muncaster, L.
Newton, L.
O'Neill, L.

Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Rosmead, L.
Rossmore, L.
Rothschild, L.
St. Oswald, L.
Scarsdale, L.
Sherborne, L.
Sinclair, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Suffield, L.
Tredegar, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wenlock, L.
Westbury, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Northampton, M.
Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Buckinghamshire, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Crewe, E.
Durham, E.
Kimberley, E.
Northbrook, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.
Temple, E.

Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)
Hampden, V.
Peel, V.

Bath and Wells, L. Bp.
Durham, L. Bp.
Hereford, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Norwich, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.
Ripon, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. Asaph, L. Bp.
St. David's, L. Bp.

Annaly, L.
Burghclere, L.

Coleridge, L.
Davey, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Farrer, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Kinnaird, L
Lyveden, L.
Monkswell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Welby, L.

POOR LAW AUTHORITIES (TRANSFER OF PROPERTY) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at five minutes before Twelve o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter-past four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 2nd August, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Felixstowe Gas Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; South Shields Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bil [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bil read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

King's College Hospital Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]. Verbal Amendments made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [Lords] (King's Consent, on behalf of the Crown and Duchy of Lancaster, signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords] (King's Consent, on behalf of the Duchy of Lancaster, signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, to be considered upon Thursday.

Trafford Park Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill. As amended, considered; a clause added; Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Glasgow and South Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill; Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Thursday.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Great Western Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to County Courts." [County Courts Bill [Lords.]

PETITIONS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table,

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petition from New Basford, for removal of prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Aberdare; East Manchester (twenty-one); Nottingham; Warwick; and Welham Bridge; to lie upon the Table.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petition from Bath, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVAL BOILERS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee on Naval Boilers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Statement showing the Financial effect of certain reduction in, and additions to the Army, proposed by the Secretary of State for War [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3243 to 3245 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.

Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. Vol. II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Sixteenth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the Law relating to Compensation for Injuries to Workmen. Vol. I., Report and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT, 1903-4.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th July; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 298.]

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Forty-eighth Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES (1902-3).

Copy presented, of Abstract of the Returns of Shipping Casualties which occurred on or near the Coasts or in Rivers and Harbours of the United Kingdom from the 1st July, 1902, to 30th June, 1903, and of the Returns of Shipping Casualties to British Vessels elsewhere than on the Coasts of the United Kingdom, and to Foreign Vessels on or near the Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours, of British Possessions Abroad, etc., with Charts and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER No. 10.

Return ordered, "of Motions for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 10, showing the date of such Motion, the name of the Member proposing, the definite matter of urgent public importance, and the result of any Division taken thereon during Session 1904 (in the same form as, and in continuation of, Parliamentary Paper, No. 318, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

CLOSURE OF DEBATE (STANDING ORDER No. 26).

Return ordered, "respecting application of Standing Order No. 26 (Closure of Debate) during Session 1904, under the following heads:— (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 319, of Session 1903).—*Mr. Caldwell.*)

1. Date when Closure moved.	2. By whom moved.	3. Question before House or Committee when moved.	4. Whether in House or Committee.	5. Whether assent given to Motion or withheld by Speaker or Chairman.	6. Assent withheld because, in the opinion of the Chair, a decision would shortly be arrived at without that Motion.	7. Result of Motion, and, if a Division, Numbers for and against.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Return ordered, "of the number of Divisions of the House in Session 1904; stating the subject of the Division, and the number of Members in the majority and minority, Tellers included; also, the aggregate number in the House on each Division; distinguishing the Divisions on Public Business from Private; and also the number of Divisions before and after midnight (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.202, of Session 1903."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

PUBLIC BILLS.

Return ordered, "of the number of Public Bills, distinguishing Government from other Bills, introduced into this House, or brought from the House of Lords, during Session 1904; showing the number which received the Royal Assent; the number which were passed by this House, but not by the House of Lords; the number passed by the House of Lords, but not by this House; and distinguishing the stages at which such Bills as did not receive the Royal Assent were dropped or postponed and rejected in either House of Parliament (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.201, of Session 1903).—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Return ordered, "of the number of Public Petitions presented and printed in Session 1904; with the total number of signatures in that year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.200, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

SELECT COMMITTEES.

Return ordered, "of the number of Select Committees appointed in Session 1904, including the Standing Committees and the Court of Referees; the subjects of inquiry; the names of the Members appointed to serve on each, and of the Chairman of each; the number of days each Committee met, and the number of days each Member attended; the total expense of the attendance of witnesses at each Select Committee, and the name of the Member who moved for such Select Committee; also the total number of Members who served on Select Committees (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.198, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Return ordered, "of the number of days on which the House sat in Session 1904, stating for each day the date of the month and day of the week, the hour of the meeting, and the hour of adjournment; and the total number of hours occupied in the Sittings of the House, and the average time; and showing the number of hours on which the House sat each day, and the number of hours after midnight; and the number of entries in each day's Votes and Proceedings (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.199, of Session 1903)."—*Mr. Caldwell.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (DAYS OCCUPIED BY GOVERNMENT AND BY PRIVATE MEMBERS).

Return ordered, "showing, with reference to Session 1904, (1) the number of Sittings at which, in accordance with the Standing Orders, Government Business had precedence; (2) the number of Evening Sittings on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and the number of Sittings on Fridays at which Private Members had precedence under the Standing Orders; (3) the number of Sittings at which Government Business had precedence under a special order of the House; (4) the number of Saturday Sittings; (5) the total number of Sittings at which Government Business had precedence; (6) the total number of days on which the House sat; (7) the total number of Motions for Adjournment of the House on a matter of urgent public importance; and (8) the number of days on which Business of Supply was considered (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 320, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

PRIVATE BILLS AND PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Return ordered, "of the number of Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders introduced into the House of Commons and brought from the House of Lords, and of Acts passed in Session 1904, classed according to the following subjects:—Railways; Tramways; Tramroads; Subways; Canals and Navigations; Roads and Bridges; Water; Waterworks; Gas; Gas and Water; Lighting and Improvement; Police and Sanitary Regulations; Corporations, etc. (not relating to Police and Sanitary Regulations or to Lighting and Improvement Schemes); Ports, Piers, Harbours, and Docks; Churches, Chapels, and Burying Grounds; Markets and Fairs; Gaols and other County Buildings; Inclosure and Drainage; Estate; Divorce; Naturalisation; Hospitals, and Miscellaneous."

"Of all the Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders which in Session 1904 have been reported on by Committees on Opposed

Private Bills or by Committees nominated partly by the House and partly by the Committee of Selection, together with the names of the selected Members who served on each Committee; the first and also the last day of the sitting of each Committee; the number of days on which each Committee sat; the number of days on which each selected Member has served; the number of days occupied by each Bill in Committee; the Bills the Preambles of which were reported to have been proved; the Bills the Preambles of which were reported to have been not proved; and, in the case of Bills for confirming Provisional Orders, whether the Provisional Orders ought or ought not to be confirmed."

"Of all Private Bills and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders which, in Session, 1904, have been referred by the Committee of Selection, or by the General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills, to the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, together with the names of the Members who served on each Committee; the number of days on which each Committee sat; and the number of days on which each Member attended."

"And, of the number of Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders withdrawn or not proceeded with by the parties, those Bills being specified which have been referred to Committees and dropped during the sittings of the Committee (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.197, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Accident on H.M.S. "Blake"—Heroism of Chief Stoker Gee—Official Recognition.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to Admiralty the whether the Admiralty intend to recognise in any special manner the heroism displayed by Chief Stoker Gee who, on the 6th August last, at the risk of his own life, rescued two men from the stokehold of H.M.S. "Blake" on the occasion of an accident to one of her boilers, seeing that for a similar act of bravery Stoker Lynch was awarded the Albert Medal.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Chief Stoker Gee displayed great courage and promptitude on the occasion of the accident on board H.M.S. "Blake." His conduct was favourably noticed at the time, and an entry to that effect was made on his parchment certificate. It would be invidious to attempt any comparison between two such brave actions as those referred to in the hon. Member's Question, but I can assure him that all the circumstances of both were fully considered.

Post Office Savings Bank Books sent in for Annual Examination.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state what percentage of the depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank fail to forward their deposit books to the head office once a year; and what percentage send in their books more than once a year.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It is estimated that less than 25 per cent. of depositors with active accounts fail to forward their books annually to headquarters for examination. There are no statistics available showing the number of depositors that send in their books more than once a year.

Fee for Letters addressed to Tain Post Office "to be called for."

MR. WEIR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is now in a position to explain why the officials at the Tain post office required persons calling for letters on the 7th instant to fill in a form and pay a charge of three pence before they would undertake to search the caller's box; and, seeing that a similar error was recently proved to have been made at the Cromer post office, will he state how these irregular charges originated, and what steps have been taken to prevent their recurrence.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) As I have already explained to the hon. Member by letter, on public holidays in Scotland (one of which was reserved at Tain on 7th July) and on bank holidays in England and Ireland, letters arriving after the morning delivery for residents who do not rent private boxes can only be obtained on payment of the usual fees for express delivery; and this will, no doubt, account for the special charge made at Tain on the 7th ultimo. Visitors, however, can use the Poste Restante without any charge.

Retiring Allowance for Mrs. F. Williams, late of Edgeworthstown Post Office.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Mrs. F. Williams, who served 27 years as sorting clerk and telegraphist in Edgeworthstown post office, left the service in February, 1904, without pension of any kind; and, seeing that in the April following an order came out making her office pensionable, and that she never had a report against her during this 27 years service, will he direct that she be granted a retiring allowance in accordance with the terms of the April circular.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Mrs. Williams did not hold an established appointment as sorting clerk and telegraphist. She was employed as assistant by the postmaster of Edgeworthstown and paid by him out of an allowance he received for providing assistance. Service of this nature is not pensionable, and it is, therefore, not in my power to obtain for Mrs. Williams any award under the Superannuation Acts, but I will inquire whether she is eligible for any gratuity from the Rowland Hill Benevolent Fund. In the latter part of his Question the hon. Member probably refers to the grant made this year by Parliament for providing gratuities in certain cases for unestablished officers. This grant was not available in the case of officers retiring before April of this year.

Vacancy in Telegraph Superintendent's Survey Branch at Leeds.

MR. BARRAN (Leeds, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a vacancy that occurred more than a year ago in the telegraph superintendent's survey branch at Leeds has not yet been filled up, and that the work is being done by junior clerks in expectation of advancement; and, if so, whether he purposes to make an appointment to fill the vacancy.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) In connection with certain changes of administration, the district under the control of the postmaster of Leeds was largely reduced on the 1st February, and in consequence it is not found necessary to fill the vacancy referred to by the hon. Member.

Death Rate and Infant Mortality in London and Provincial Unions.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will grant a Return of the death rates and infant mortality of the London unions and of the unions of Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Sheffield, Leeds, and Bristol, with information as to the ratio of indoor and outdoor pauperism to th population, and the total cost of Poor Law relief in these unions per head of population.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am willing to give a Return of the kind indicated by the hon. Member. I do not gather, however, for what period the information is desired and, perhaps, the hon. Member will send me the draft of a Notice of Motion, indicating more precisely what he wishes on this point. I shall then be happy to consider its terms before it is put down.

Schemes for Creation of County Boroughs—Powers of Local Government Board to Award Costs.

MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state under what statute the Local Government Board possesses power to award costs as between local authorities promoting, and local authorities and individuals opposing, schemes for the creation of county boroughs, and the alteration or extension of local government boundaries.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The only powers which the Local Government Board possess in cases of this kind are those conferred by Section 87 of The Local Government Act, 1888.

Extension of Crofters Act to Small Crofter Leaseholders in the Highlands.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that crofters under the Act on the Ferintosh Estate (Black Isle), Ross-shire, have had arrears cancelled and fair rents fixed by the Crofters Commission, whilst tenants on this estate who were leaseholders at the time of the passing of the Crofters Act are now threatened with eviction for non-payment of arrears of rack rent, will he say whether he proposes to extend the benefits of the Crofters Act to small crofter leaseholders in the Highland crofting counties.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I have no knowlegde of the facts alleged in the first part of the hon. Member's Question, and I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave on 11th February, 1904.†

Return of Hours of Railway Servants.

Mr. BELL (Derby): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state when the Return of Hours worked by Railway Servants in October, 1903, will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) A number of the companies have not yet sent in their Returns, and their attention has been called to the matter. I cannot say when the complete Return will be issued, but no time will be lost by the Board of Trade in hastening its completion.

Percentage of Non-Employment in the Trades of the Principal Industrial Countries.

Sir EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he could obtain and publish comparative figures showing the amount and percentage of non-employment in the skilled and unskilled trades of the principal industrial countries.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Such statistical information on this difficult subject as it has been found possible to obtain has been compiled in accordance with a promise made to my hon. friend earlier in the session, and will be ready for publication shortly.

Increase in Vivisection Experiments.

Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the increase in the numbers of medical and surgical experiments performed on living animals, amounting to 19,084 in 1903, as compared with 14,906 in 1902, and 11,645 in 1901; and whether he intends to take any steps to limit the number.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The increase pointed out by the hon. Member in the number of experiments in recent years is almost wholly in those included in Table IV. (B) of the Annual Return, *i.e.*, Experiments of the nature of Simple Inoculations, Hypodermic Injections, and similar proceedings. It is pointed out on page 5 of the Return, that the increase is due mainly to the progressive importance attached to biological tests generally in practical medicine for the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease, and to the more widely recognised need for such experiments on the part of those responsible for the care of the public health. It may be added that over 3,000 of the experiments performed in 1903 were made for Government Departments, or for county or borough councils, and 1,313 were made for the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis. Every application for authority to perform experiments is carefully scrutinised, but I am not prepared to take action in the direction suggested.

Advertising of Patent Medicines.

Mr. TANKERVILLE CHAMBERLAYNE (Southampton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of imposing some restrictions on the advertising of patent medicines, with a view to protecting persons of the poorer classes.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I am not sure what class of patent medicines my hon. friend has in mind. The question of legislation for the purpose of dealing with certain evils in this connection has been considered in my Department, but there are many difficulties in the way of framing a measure which would be satisfactory and neither inoperative nor too wide in its scope.

Ankylostomia Infection—Recommendations of Dr. Boycott.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of Dr. Boycott's Report on the subject of the diagnosis of ankylostomia infection in mines and its recommendations, and of the fact that following his circular letter of 10th March to the county councils, the medical officer of health to the Derbyshire County Council issued a memorandum to the medical men in the county relating to the disease and the precautions which should be adopted to prevent the spreading of this disease, he will now furnish the Derbyshire County Council with the necessary powers under the Coal Mines Regulation Act to enable the medical officer of health to give practical effect to the recommendations of Dr. Boycott's Report.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxix., 1030.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) Dr. Boycott's Report deals simply with the mode of detecting ankylostomia infection by examination of the blood, and contains no recommendations as to precautions to be taken against an outbreak of the disease. It is true that amongst other steps which, as I have previously explained, I have taken in this matter, I have invited the co-operation of the county councils in the mining districts, with a view to their spreading information among miners as to the precautions to be observed, and also to their furnishing facilities at the county laboratories for examination of infected matter; but there are no powers under the Coal Mines Act which can be conferred on the county councils.

Accidents in Mines—Responsibility of Owners and Managers.

MR. MARKHAM: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, seeing that certificated managers of mines are from time to time indicted for manslaughter owing to fatal accidents occurring in their mines, he will issue orders to inspectors of mines that they should instruct the certificated managers to enter into their daily report books all recommendations which they consider essential to the safe working of the mines, and that where colliery managers have brought such recommendation before their employers, he will advise His Majesty's inspector to prosecute the owners in place of the certificated managers where loss of life takes place owing to the owners having refused to give effect to such recommendations of their managers.

(*Answered by Mr. Akers-Douglas.*) The hon. Member is, I think, under a misapprehension; the inspectors of mines have nothing to do with prosecutions of mine managers for manslaughter. So far as prosecutions for contraventions of the Mines Acts are concerned, an inspector would always carefully consider where the responsibility for the contravention really lay before taking proceedings. The inspectors have no power to give the instructions suggested in the Question.

Indian Village Police.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India, with regard to the proposals under consideration for better utilisation of the Indian indigenous village police as distinguished from the the uniformed district police, can some such proposals towards extended use of the village police as partly substituting them for district police be given effect to without waiting for any elaborated plan dealing with the whole subject of the India police services.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am unable to make any announcement as to measures to be undertaken to give effect to the recommendations of the India Police Commission until I receive the conclusions of the Government of India upon the Report. As I have already stated on previous occasions, that Government has been asked to deal with the Report as expeditiously as possible.

Salary of Teacher of School, Roll No. 8145.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the principal teacher of school, Roll No. 8145, has not received an increment, although he is trained first class, has almost twenty-five years satisfactory service as principal school average over 100, and has these reports from inspectors; year 1900, school is in a satisfactory state; year 1901, report marked good; year 1902, report marked fair; year 1903, report marked good; and year 1904, report marked very good.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) This teacher received an increment of £2 from the 1st April, 1903, which raised his salary to £107, the maximum salary of his grade.

Promotion of Irish Male Principal School Teachers.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutentant of Ireland whether he can state how many male principal teachers have been promoted to second division of first grade since the end of the triennial period, 1903; what were the conditions under which promotion was granted to these teachers, and how many were promoted to this grade who had not a single report marked very good or excellent during same period.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Sixty-five male principal teachers have been promoted to the second division of first grade since the end of the triennial period 1903. These promotions were made under the conditions laid down in Rule 195 (g) and (i). There have been no cases such as indicated at the conclusion of the Question.

Gold Commandeered by late South African Republic—Claim of British Banks.

MR. WEIR: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider the expediency of appointing a Select Committee of the House of Commons to consider the claims made by British banks in South Africa in respect of gold commandeered by the Government of the late South African Republic.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am advised that this claim has been dealt with in accordance with certain general principles which have been applied to all such cases. The reasons have been fully set out in correspondence, and the view of the Government is that such a Committee as the hon. Member proposes should not be appointed.

Trades Disputes Commission.

MR. BELL: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state the date when the Royal Commission to inquire into Trade Disputes was appointed; how many sittings has it held and the total number of hours of such sittings; how many witnesses have been examined; and when is it likely to conclude its inquiry and report.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Question of the hon. Member amounts to a Motion for a Return as to the day-to-day proceedings of a Royal Commission. It must be remembered that a Royal Commission does not owe its appointment to Parliament, and conducts its proceedings wholly without reference to the Government of the day. Beyond answering, as by the courtesy of the Chairman I sometimes am enabled to do, some Question as to the probable date of a Report, I should not consider it to be a wise precedent to call for all the particulars set out in the hon. Member's inquiry in the case of this or any other Royal Commission.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Boiler Committee's Report.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when the final Report of the Boiler Committee will be in the hands of Members; and whether figures can be given to show the actual mean consumption of coal per indicated horse-power per hour in the case of the Belleville boiler, of the Babcock boiler, and of the Yarrow boiler.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): I had already taken steps to ensure this Report being in the hands of Members at an early date, and I hope copies will be delivered at the House to-morrow. There are, however, enclosures containing diagrams, which will take some time to print. These will be issued to Members at the earliest possible moment. With regard to the latter part of the right hon. Member's Question, I must refer him to the Answer I gave to his Question of the 6th July.†

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: That Answer was in my mind, but it did not show exactly what I asked for. It showed the average taken between the highest and the lowest but not the true average.

MR. PRETYMAN: I will do what I can.

Militia and Volunteers—Cost of Compulsory Training.

COLONEL LLEWELLYN (Somersetshire N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will lay upon the Table the figures upon which it is estimated that the adoption of the recommendation of the Report of the Royal Commission on Militia and Volunteers with respect to compulsory training would cost a yearly sum of £25,900,000.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxvii., 775.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The figures have just been laid and will shortly be in the hands of Members.

South African Military Stores Scandal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether investigation by the War Office authorities of the various dealings of Colonel Morgan with military stores in South Africa and the peculation of public money, which has been the subject of the strong condemnation from the Bench of the Chief Justice of the Transvaal with reference to those dealings, is to be suspended pending the hearing of actions for libel brought by Colonel Morgan against certain organs of the London Press; and, if so, whether Colonel Morgan is under any and, if so, what obligation to the War Office to proceed with these actions; and whether, having regard to the fact that none of the actions, if expeditiously pressed forward, can be heard for many months, and that after lapse of time there will be difficulty in sifting the dealings in South Africa of Colonel Morgan and his subordinates with the property and money of the public invested in military stores, and to the effect of the delay of the War Office in dealing with this case, he will say whether any and, if so, what undertaking will be given by the War Office that these transactions will be thoroughly and speedily investigated.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: As I have already informed the hon. and learned Member, no steps will be taken by the War Office in this matter until the case has been decided in Court. Colonel Morgan is under no obligations to the War Office to proceed with the case. Should the result of the case prove the necessity of inquiry by the War Office, the hon. Member may rest assured that full investigation will be made.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Does not the right hon. Gentleman see that that inquiry cannot be made for several months and in the meantime may be destroyed? Will he give us an assurance that the War Office will make an investigation, as there is a suspicion they are shielding the offenders?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order The Question has been answered.

Local Self-Government for South African Colonies.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is proposed to confer a measure of local self-government upon the Orange River Colony at the same time as upon the Transvaal Colony; and, if not, whether he will state the reason why.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): No final conclusions have been arrived at by His Majesty's Government on this subject.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what voice, if any, it is proposed to give the House of Commons in the form of local self-government to be conferred upon the Transvaal Colony before the matter is finally determined.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper—

DR. MACNAMARA: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the Notice of Motion handed in on Tuesday, 26th July, by the hon. Baronet the Member for the Handsworth Division, relating to representative government in the Transvaal; and, if so, whether he will give an opportunity for the discussion of this proposed Motion before the close of the present session or before any operative steps are taken in the matter of conferring the proposed form of self-government upon the Transvaal.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The hon. Member has two Questions down in regard to time for the discussion of this question. So far as I am aware, there is no precedent at all, in the many cases which have occurred in which similar proceedings have been taken with regard to British Colonies, for a preliminary discussion upon the subject. Of course anything which requires statutory sanction by this House would have to be fully discussed by this House, and even in the absence of statutory sanction, of course there are opportunities when the House can call in question any action of the Government.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will there be legislative action?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course legislative action can only take place in the House subject to the discussion of the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Is there any precedent for a case of this sort, where a large community, such as lives in the Transvaal, has been incorporated in the British Empire as the result of a war, and then has had representative government given to it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know that the mode in which this country became possessed of the Colony is very relevant to the fact of giving it a Constitution. A great many of our Colonies have been obtained by war, and a great many by peaceful occupation; but I do not think either of these considerations is relevant.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Will there not be a Constitution set up in the Transvaal by Act of Parliament as in the case of Western Australia?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If, and when, that happens clearly Parliament will have full power to discuss it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Will there be?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Are the Government not to be allowed to consider that point?

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): To clear up the point, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will tell us whether it is intended to take action for establishing these representative institutions before the House reassembles next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no intention, as I understand, of taking any action between this session and next session which requires the legislative sanction of this House.

DR. MACNAMARA: In the event of this matter being settled by an Order in Council, will operative steps be taken before Parliament has had some voice in the determination of the form of self-government?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is impossible at the present stage to say whether it will or will not require an Order in Council. That I cannot state with positive assurance. But certainly we shall not be precluded from proceeding with our policy.

DR. MACNAMARA: In the event of the matter being capable of settlement by Order in Council and not by legislation, will the Government then contemplate going on with the matter before the House has had the opportunity of discussing it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We shall not consider ourselves precluded from taking such a course.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman give a pledge?

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): Will you not give us a day to discuss the matter?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Questions on the Paper have been fully answered, and a good many more.

DR. MACNAMARA: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered my second Question on the Paper which was addressed to him.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I understood that the right hon. Gentleman answered the two Questions together.

DR. MACNAMARA: With all respect, No, Sir. I desire to ask him whether he will give a day for the discussion of this proposed Motion of the hon. Member for the Handsworth Division before the close of the present session, or before any operative steps are taken in the matter of conferring the proposed form of self-government upon the Transvaal.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought I had answered that Question already. The hon. Gentleman and the House must see clearly that it is perfectly impossible for us to discuss the scheme of the Government until that scheme is settled. It is not settled, and any discussion or any expenditure of time upon it would, in my opinion, be wholly wasteful.

Factory Act Regulations for Docks.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to make regulations in regard to the loading, unloading, and discharging of ships in docks or otherwise; and, if so, having regard to the interests that will be affected by such regulations, will he undertake that such regulations shall not be brought into operation until they have lain upon the Table of the House the forty days prescribed by the 84th Section of The Factory Act, 1901; and that the draft regulations, if any, as finally settled by the Home Office, may be available to Members and the public at the earliest date possible.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Draft regulations under the Factory Act relating to docks have been the subject of public inquiry since the beginning of the year. I understand that the inquiry is now concluded; and when the Commissioner's Report is in my hands I shall proceed to consider the formal making of the regulations. When made, the regulations will at once be laid before the House, in accordance with the Act, and will be available to all persons interested. In view of the full hearing given by means of the long and careful inquiry to all interests affected by the regulations, I do not feel called upon to postpone the date when the regulations will come into force.

MR. RENWICK: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that these regulations shall lie on the Table for forty days while the House is sitting?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I do not think I can undertake that. The draft regulations were issued to those concerned in the first instance, and they sent in what objections they had to the scheme. A Commissioner was appointed, and the whole thing was thrashed out. When the regulations are made they will come into force, but it will be open to any Member to raise any point on these regulations in the House when Parliament reassembles.

Denbighshire Burial Dispute.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the refusal on 20th May by the Rector of Clocaenog, Denbighshire, of the parish bier for the interment of the late Mr. John Hughes, a parishioner, under the Burial Law (Amendment) Act, 1880; whether he is aware that difficulties under such circumstances frequently occur with regard to the use of the parish bier; and whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any legislation on the subject.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I had not heard of this matter until the hon. Member drew my attention to it; and I am afraid I must ask him to put the Question to me again a day or two hence, as I have not yet received the answer to inquiries which I have made on the subject.

Slaughter of Animals.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he intends to legislate, or advise local authorities to act, on the recommendation of the Departmental Committee which reported that all animals, without exception, must be stunned or otherwise rendered unconscious before blood is drawn.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The Report of the

Committee referred to by the hon Member has only just been issued, and I have not at present arrived at a decision with regard to the recommendations made in it. The subject, is, however, receiving my consideration.

Dr. FARQUHARSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly bring this matter under the notice of the local authorities, so that they may take any action they may deem desirable?

Mr. WALTER LONG: That is one suggestion I am considering. I shall be very glad if I am able indirectly to do something in that direction.

Jury Challenging at Cork Assizes.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, in connection with recent proceedings at the Cork Summer Assizes, in the trials of Michael Barry and Patrick Fitzgerald, in which forty-five and twenty-five jurors respectively were ordered to stand by, whether he can now say on whose authority and upon what information the Crown Solicitor acted in stating that canvassing of jurors was practised before the opening of the trials; and whether the constabulary authorities made any report in regard to the alleged canvassing.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): In the case of Barry, the Crown Solicitor obtained his information from the police and from one of the Grand Jurors who stated that he was himself canvassed. In the Fitzgerald case, which was a Whiteboy offence, the Crown Solicitor came to the conclusion on which he acted from the fact that a subscription for the defence of the prisoner had been got up and was extensively subscribed to throughout the county, and that before the assizes the principal witness for the prosecution, when on his way to Mass, was publicly hooted at, called an informer and stoned, and also from the reports furnished to him by the police.

Mr. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that owing to this system of jury challenging Sergeant Sheridan procured the conviction of three innocent men?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Captain DONELAN (Cork County, E.): Is it the fact that out of seventy jurors ordered to stand aside at least sixty-five were Catholics?

Mr. ATKINSON: I have no information as to that.

Irish Lunatic Asylums—Married Assistant Medical Officers.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of assistant medical officers of lunatic asylums in Ireland, and of these how many are married.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The total number of assistant medical officers in district asylums is thirty-five. No married men can be appointed to this position. I have no information as to marriages, if any, contracted subsequently to appointment.

Mr. HAYDEN: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman obtain the information?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am afraid not.

Irish Assistant Teachers.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether managers of national schools may henceforward appoint assistant teachers in schools maintaining an average of daily attendance of fifty pupils.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have stated that the provision for effecting a reduction in the average attendance required for an assistant teacher cannot operate until funds have been placed at the disposal of the Commissioners. The revised Development Grant Estimate, to be laid on the Table in the course of a few days, will make provision in this respect, but no action can be taken by the Commissioners to give effect to it until the money has been voted by Parliament.

King Harman Estate, County Longford.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether, in the case of the sale of the King Harman (Kenagh), county Longford estate, the Estates Commissioners have decided to take action towards securing the farm of Creagh for the evicted tenant, Mr. Robert Armstrong.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The holding in question is in occupation of another person, who has lodged an agreement for purchase. The case will be considered in the ordinary course by the Commissioners, and I am unable to say, by way of anticipation, what action they may take in respect to it.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Is the right hon. Gentlemen aware that the landlord in this case has lodged a claim against the tenant of £250 for dilapidation and damages?

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

King Harman Estate—Case of William H. Plant, of Toome.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether any application has been made by the landlord, Colonel W. H. King Harman, to exclude from the sale of that estate the farm of William H. Plant, of Toome, whose farm is one of the worst on the estate, for which 25 years purchase (which the tenant refused to give) has been demanded; and, if so, what action he proposes to take.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Plant refused to accept the landlord's terms and an application has been made to exclude him from the sale. This application is under consideration by the Commissioners.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Will the tenant be allowed to be legally represented at the hearing of the application?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge as to that.

Irish Government—Correspondence Regulations.

Mr. GRETTON (Derbyshire, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if all correspondence from the heads of departments in the Irish Government is now to be addressed to the Chief Secretary's Office in Dublin; and, if so, if he will state the reasons for this change in the regulations; and if all communications so addressed are opened by the Under-Secretary.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

Mr. DELANY: Who inspired this Question?

[No Answer was returned.]

Conveyance of Horses to Cork Show.

Captain DONELAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to a resolution unanimously adopted by the Midleton (county Cork) Rural District Council, protesting against the accommodation provided by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company for the conveyance of horses from Midleton to the recent Cork Show, when valuable horses had to be conveyed in cattle trucks owing to the failure to provide horse boxes; and, if so, whether official communication will be made to the company with a view to secure better arrangements in future.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has supplied me with a newspaper report of the resolution. No representations, however, have been addressed to the Department in the matter, and until this has been done it cannot take action.

Captain DONELAN: If representations are made, will they be favourably considered?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have said on previous occasions that unnecessary delay is caused by addressing these Questions to me instead of directly to the Department concerned.

Kerry Evicted Tenants—Payments by Congested Districts Board.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a letter was addressed by Sir Antony MacDonnell, dated 31st March, 1904, to the hon. Member for East Kerry, who communicated its contents to a meeting of the East Kerry Executive of the United Irish League, in which Sir Antony MacDonnell stated that the Congested Districts Board consented to grant as a matter of grace and compassion the sum of £500 to the surviving representatives of two tenants named John Lyne and Patrick Cronin, who had been evicted by the Land Commission for non-payment of their instalments in the year 1890; and, if so, whether he can state out of what fund and under what statute such money had been offered.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. The letter was written by my instruction, given in pursuance of a decision arrived at by the Congested Districts Board. The Board acted under the Act of 1891 and amending Acts, which invest them with all the powers of a landlord.

Doohoma National School—Alleged Ill-treatment of Children.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Patrick Kelleher, principal teacher in the national school at Doohoma, county Mayo, was reported to the school manager, the Rev. Father Dolphin, for ill-treating a schoolboy named Walter Spencer; and, if so, will he say whether the Rev. Father Dolphin forwarded the report to the authorities; and whether, seeing that Patrick Kelleher, before his appointment as teacher at Doohoma, was fined at petty sessions, and also fined by the Commissioners for his treatment of children attending his school, and that a little girl named Margaret Roy has been ill for a considerable time owing to a beating administered by this teacher, an inquiry will be instituted into the conduct of the teacher and immediate steps be taken to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners have no information on the subject, but they are in correspondence with the manager of the school. Perhaps my hon. and gallant friend will postpone the Question for a few days.

Trinity College—Receipts under the Irish Church Act.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what sum was paid to Trinity College, Dublin, as compensation for the Church livings taken in 1869; has this sum been used for the purposes served by the Church livings, namely, to provide pensions on retirement for the fellows, or to provide pensions for the professors or any other officials or for any other, and, if so, what purposes; has the capital sum been increased by accumulation of the interest, if so, what is its present amount; if otherwise, what is the cause of the diminution; whether he is aware that Lord Iveagh has offered a sum for the purposes of providing laboratories and the equipment thereof in a number of the scientific departments, which are in pressing need thereof, on condition that £3,000 per annum is provided for the upkeep of the same; whether, in order to prevent the advantage of this offer being lost to the College, the income of the fund mentioned above can be applied to this purpose.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Report of the Commissioners of Church Temporalities for the period of 1869 to 1880, which was presented to Parliament in 1881, contains a list of the names of person to whom payments were made under the Irish Church Act, 1869. I have no further information on the subject, and no information in respect to the other matters mentioned in the Question.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: This is public money. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it is "jobbed"?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have no responsibility in the matter.

Bennett Estate, King's County.

Mr. DELANY: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a tenant named James Dooley, the Pass, Kinnity, King's county, estate of F. P. Bennett, whose rent was raised on appeal from £110 7s. 6d., fixed by the Sub-Commission, to £116 7s. 6d., has applied by letter three times to the Land Commission for a copy of the Court assessor's report in his case, and has been denied even a reply to his communications; and, if so, whether he will state why this information has been withheld.

Mr. WYNDHAM: A copy of the report was sent to this tenant on Tuesday last.

King's County Appeals.

Mr. DELANY: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the appeal cases from King's county, heard in Dublin on the 28th April, and in which judgment was delivered on the 21st June, the Land Commission raised all the rents fixed by the Sub-Commissioners; and, if so, can he state on what basis those increases were made.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Land Commission Court decides judicially in each case after hearing the evidence of the parties, upon consideration of the report of the valuers, and of all the circumstances of the case, holding, and district.

Mr. DELANY: May I ask if the wholesale raising of rent is one of the results of the retirement of Mr. Murrough O'Brien?

The Drainage of the Barrow.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution passed at a meeting of the Triogue River Drainage Board, pointing out the necessity of cleaning up and sinking the River Barrow; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that this board has spent £1,750, repayable solely from local sources, which outlay will become unproductive if the condition of the River Barrow is not improved, he will state what steps he proposes taking in this matter.

Mr. DELANY: I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to communications made to the Board of Works, relative to the formation of local drainage boards, for the purpose of draining the River Barrow in sections between Athy and Mountmellick; and as the owners and occupiers of the lands affected are prepared to tax themselves, whether he will state what aid the Government is prepared to give, in view of the fact that the Royal Commission, 1887, recommended a substantial free Treasury grant to be made for the purpose of carrying out these works.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer the two Questions together. I have seen the resolution referred to; and other communications have been received by the Board of Works from various persons making proposals for partial drainage schemes. Any persons prepared to proceed with such schemes under the Arterial Drainage Acts can do so without the assistance of Government. The Royal Commission in 1887 recommended a comprehensive scheme to cost £354,000, of which £75,000 would be contributed by Government. The Bill introduced by the Government in 1888 to give effect to this recommendation was not passed, and I can hold out no hope of a free contribution to partial schemes, the success of which cannot be guaranteed.

Ireland's Contribution to the British Exchequer.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can say how the figures of the adjusted revenue, giving the true contribution of Ireland as compared with the collected revenue, are arrived at by the Treasury authorities; and, seeing that the contribution of Ireland in respect of tea duty for 1903–4, if calculated on the same basis as in former years, would have been £919,000, he can explain how the last Customs Return of the tea duty, under the head of adjusted revenue, gives the amount at the figure of £672,000.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.). I explained the nature of the recent inquiries in some detail in answer to the hon. Member for North Dublin on the 21st of July†.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 771.

Returns were obtained from the companies engaged in the shipping trade between Great Britain and Ireland of the amounts of sugar, tea, and wine interchanged between the two countries during the financial year 1903–4. On the basis of these returns the figures of revenue collected in Great Britain and Ireland on those articles during the financial year were adjusted so as to allow for the amounts of duty paid in one division of the United Kingdom on an article consumed in the other. In the case of tea the inquiries went to show that, although the amount of duty collected in Ireland was only £340,000, the duty paid upon tea consumed in Ireland was £672,000, and Ireland is accordingly credited with that increased contribution in the published Return. In the Financial Relations Returns for previous years similar adjustments have been made on the basis of inquiries carried out in 1890–91. But the inquiries in that year extended only over four months, while those of 1903–4 covered the whole financial year. I think there can be no doubt that the figure of £672,000 arrived at by the recent inquiry is much more trustworthy than the figure of £919,000 which the old computation would have given.

MR. FLYNN: But, in view of the fact that Ireland is an island, cannot the right hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of removing her trade from the category of mere coasting trade, so that we may have proper Returns?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not prepared to propose the establishment of a separate system of Customs for her trade as against the trade of this country.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Ireland had her own system prior to 1823?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Interference with British Shipping—The "Knight Commander."

MR. HOULT (Cheshire, Wirrall): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he is aware that the British Minister at Tokio has instituted an inquiry into the circumstances attending the sinking of the British steamer "Knight Commander," and whether he has sanctioned this inquiry; and, if so, whether he will cause instructions to be given to British representatives abroad, in all cases of seizure or interference with British shipping, to hold an inquiry forthwith and furnish His Majesty's Government with all the information obtainable.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Minister at Tokio was instructed on the 25th ultimo to make full inquiries into the case of the "Knight Commander." As to the second part of the Question, I think it is clear that a general roving commission to all His Majesty's representatives to make inquiries is not required. We shall carefully watch events and do our best to make ourselves fully acquainted with all cases of hardship.

Army Reorganisation—Parliamentary Discussion.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury in what manner, and when, it is proposed to obtain the approval of Parliament to the proposals of the Secretary of State for War for the division of the Army into a home-service Army and a foreign-service Army, and for the separation of the Volunteers into a first class on a large grant, and a second class on a reduced grant, and the reduction of the numbers by one-fourth; and if, having regard to the fact that the Estimates for the current year have for the most part been voted, he can give an assurance that no such change shall be made by Warrant or otherwise without full discussion in the House of Commons, and specific approval by Resolution or statute.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean†, who put an unstarred Question closely bearing upon this point, I observed that the Estimate for the War Office, if agreed to, seems to afford an adequate basis for any change not requiring legislation which may be announced as in contemplation.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the debate will be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Next Monday.

---

† See page 254

The Judge Advocate-General.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, by whom at present is the office of Judge Advocate-General filled, and who is the Minister of the Crown responsible for the advice tendered to the Crown with reference to the administration of military law; and whether, having regard to the various questions of difficulty and complication which have arisen with reference to the military and civil *status* of Lord Dundonald, and the absence of a responsible Minister from either House of Parliament to explain that *status* and describe the points of difference between military and common law, the office of Judge Advocate-General will be restored to its former position of a Parliamentary office held by a Minister of the Crown responsible for advice on matters of military law to Parliament.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is aware that this office is now filled by Sir Francis Jeune. The Government do not contemplate going back to the originally and, I think, almost universally condemned system [Cries of "No"]—well, largely condemned system by which the Judge Advocate-General was a Minister of the Crown. We prefer the present practice, which was adopted after considerable deliberation.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Who is the Minister of the Crown responsible to this House?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Minister responsible for dealing with these matters is the Secretary for War.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Who knows nothing whatever about them.

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, seeing that the Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill has been brought forward by the Government four years in succession, will he state whether he proposes to proceed with it this session; and, if so, when.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will wait for my statement.

Whitstable Education Foundation.

Mr. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the action of the Board of Education and the Charity Commission in co-operating to set aside The Education Act, 1902, by an *ex post facto* scheme under the Charitable Trusts Act in connection with the Whitstable Education Foundation; whether he is aware that it is proposed to take an undenominational endowment for teachers' salaries and divert it for thirty years to the rebuilding or enlargement of premises appropriated to a Church of England school; and whether, having regard to the fact that the Kent County Council and the Urban District Council of Whitstable both have protested strongly against the scheme, will he give an opportunity, on the Civil Service Estimates or otherwise, for the House to consider the conduct of the two public Departments implicated; and will he use his influence with them to secure that the scheme shall not be sealed until such discussion shall have taken place.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that this endowment has been the subject of three or four Questions in this House during the last two months. I am also informed that the endowment cannot fairly be called undenominational, nor has its character in this respect been altered by the Charity Commissioners of the Board of Education. The Kent County Council approved the plans submitted to them by the trustees before the publication of the scheme. The scheme was sent to the Whitstable Urban District Council when published on April 29th, and no objection was made to it. It was sealed on July 8th. Since then the council has protested, but the scheme having been sealed it is not in the power of the Charity Commissioners to deal with it except on the application of the trustees. The matter is now one for the Chancery Division of the High Court, to whom the council can appeal.

Post Office Sites Bill—Question of Order.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked the Speaker a Question as to the Orders of the Day. No. 7 of the Orders referred to a proposal to recommit the Post Office Sites Bill, which had already passed through Committee, and Order 43 dealt with a Committee Resolution with regard to the same Bill. He understood on a previous occasion it was necessary to have a Resolution of the House before the Committee upstairs could proceed to consider the Bill, inasmuch as it involved expenditure.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member had better wait until the Order is called on.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The circumstances are these. We found that a money Resolution was not necessary if I put the purchase-money for the various sites on next year's Votes, when I shall be in a position to give the full details of the prices I ask the House to pay for the sites. That course it is proposed to take.

MR. WHITLEY: But I am raising a much more serious point than that.

*MR. SPEAKER: This is not the time to raise it.

MR. WHITLEY: Very well, Sir, I will raise it when the Bill is taken.

FOREIGN SHIPS (APPLICATION OF STATUTORY POWERS) BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence [Inquiry not completed].

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 299.]

DEAN FOREST BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.

COUNTY COURTS BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 291.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (GOVERNMENT BUSINESS)—SUSPENSION OF THE TWELVE O'CLOCK RULE.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I rise to move, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government business be not interrupted, except at half-past seven of the clock at an afternoon sitting, under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; and that at the conclusion of Government business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put." I have a very modest and uninteresting statement to make in defence of the Resolution. The Resolution is brought forward at a considerably later period than has been customary in my Parliamentary experience. I do not wish to deal with matters in a controversial spirit, and I am not going to review the general course of the session. I will only remind hon. Members that in this session, and in this session alone, we have gone from beginning to end of it without interfering with the rights of private Members. It is quite true, of course, that these rights were largely curtailed by the alteration of the rules in a previous session, but I think it will be admitted that private Members now know where they are, and that the privileges they have are far greater than they formerly possessed. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] That is a matter to be dealt with, not by jeering, but by simple arithmetic. Let hon. Gentlemen look at the records of previous years and they will find that Government after Government have taken away the time of private Members. Hon. Members may prefer a nominal right which they never had to the real right they are allowed to exercise. I can only point out that before Easter they had two evenings secured to them every week, and one evening weekly between Easter and Whitsuntide, besides the Fridays which were given up to Private Bill legislation. That has never happened before in my memory, or in the memory of anyone whose recollection extends back twenty years, and I think it is a matter for congratulation.

There is still — although I hope this session is rapidly nearing its end — a certain amount of public business which must be got through. There are certain administrative Bills that have to be passed in order that the work of the country may be carried on—Bills which are necessary for the ordinary administration of public affairs.

Among those Bills I would mention one to enable the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make the necessary borrowings in order to carry on public works already sanctioned, and to complete operations which the contractors have already begun. There is also the Cunard agreement, the principle of which has been discussed in a previous session and the substance agreed to, and which only requires the House to carry out its public obligations. There is another Bill which I do not think will raise any opposition on either side—the Wireless Telegraphy Bill. It is in charge of the Post Office, but the most important part of its substance deals with an important problem of national defence. Supposing we were —which Heaven forbid—involved in any foreign difficulty, it might be a serious matter if we lacked control over wireless telegraphy in this country. I hope I may count on the House in helping us to pass a measure that really is, I think, of great importance to national interests. Then there is the Irish Development Grant, the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, the Public Works (Loans) Bill, the Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, which have to be annually passed, and the Post Office Sites Bill, which ought to be dealt with without difficulty. I have been somewhat alarmed by the point raised by the hon. Member for Halifax, but I hope he will not stand in the way of this Bill becoming law.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): It is a constitutional question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I was not aware that the Bill raised constitutional points of magnitude. Then there is a small local Bill which the Local Government Board desire to pass—the Poor Law Authorities Bill—which deals with the amalgamation of two parishes. It is purely local in its character, although technically it is a general Bill. I hope I may add to the list the Southwark and Birmingham Bishoprics Bill, which ought to be regarded as in the nature of an administrative measure. I come now to measures which involve policy. There is the Defaulting Authorities Bill—a small Bill embodied in a single clause.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): A singular clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It has, of course, controversial points, but it is not inaptly described as a small Bill. There is also in this category the Shop Hours Bill and the Anglo-French Agreement, on all of which I understand there is general agreement. There is a small Indian Council's Bill, to enable the Viceroy to add to the number of members of the India Council. That is the only way to meet the burdens of administrative duties, which in India, as in other countries, tend to increase. We are extremely desirous it should pass, lest the health of our public servants should break down. Then there is the Irish Land Bill, and a small Public Health Bill which is necessary to enable us to carry out treaty obligations in connection with sanitary matters. That exhausts the Bills that must be dealt with before the end of the session. I now come to the Bills which I think should be at once dropped. We propose to drop the Port of London Bill, the Aliens Bill, the Valuation Bill, the Butter Bill, the Fisheries Bill, the Penal Servitude Bill, the Lunacy Bill, and the Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Oh!

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I gather whence that cry emanated, perhaps in another year the hon. Member will help us to pass the Bill.

*MR. WEIR: It has been waiting for four years.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is a Naval Prize Bill—a Bill which ought to be on the Statute-book, but I am afraid there is little chance of passing it during the present session—the Barracks Sites Bill, Solicitors Bill, Police (Superannuation) Bill, Duke of York's School Bill, Married Women's Property Bill, Prisons (Scotland) Bill, Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill, and the Crown Lands Bill. I am told by the Secretary for Scotland that the Prisons (Scotland) Bill may be allowed to pass unopposed, and I shall, therefore, be delighted to transfer it from the condemned list to the one which is to receive, I hope, more fortunate treatment. There is the Local Authorities (Treasury Powers) Bill, which would, I fear, take up more time than the House has at its disposal. There remains the Scottish Education Bill. That Bill has caused me a deal of anxiety. I had hoped at one time that it was a Bill which was not only in its main principles satisfactory to the people of Scotland, and to the Members representing that country on both sides, but that in its details it would not excite any prolonged discussion in the House. The discussions we have had upon it were interrupted on one or two occasions by an adjournment Motion or some other device familiar to Members, and therefore my hon. friend the Secretary for Scotland has not had all the chances he hoped for in dealing with the measure. We have now got to a period of the session in which, if there be any discussion required on the Bill, it seems to be impossible either to find the time in this House or to give in another place the opportunity of discussing a measure which seems to be peculiarly within its functions to deal with at a convenient season. I have made it my business to find out whether the treatment of the Bill will be of a smaller volume and take less time. I regret to say that all the omens are unfavourable, and I do not think it possible for us to proceed with the Bill this session. I have, however, taken to heart the commentary made on the conduct of business in respect of that Bill by the right hon. Gentleman opposite at an earlier period of the session. The Leader of the Opposition and the right hon. Member for East Fife, I think, complained that this Bill had not been sent to a Grand Committee instead of the Aliens Bill. It is probably indubitable that we can early next session deal with the subject in detail, and I shall then propose that it be referred to a Grand Committee. Experience shows that when a subject is threshed out in Grand Committee it takes less time on Report. Though, to my regret, I see no hope of proceeding with the Bill this session, I trust that without any long delay its successor in title may be made the law of the land. That completes the list of the Bills we propose to drop. In this list of Bills there are certain measures that we had hoped to pass, but we frankly acknowledge that they cannot be passed unless we have authentic reason to know that they will not excite discussion.

Then there are Bills which we hope to pass as uncontroversial. These are the the Alkali, etc., Works Bill and the False Statements (Companies) Bill. The last-named is demanded, but if it requires discussion it must be postponed. There is also the Light Railways Bill. The War Office are anxious to have a Bill dealing with some points in the constitution of the Army Council, but there are the Seamen's and Soldiers' False Characters Bill, the Naval and Military Medals Bill, and the Reserve Forces Bill, about which the Secretary of State for War may be able to give more information than I have. Next there comes the Dogs Bill. I have received a hint by one of those subtle connections between Bills dealing with apparently different subjects that the feeling aroused by the Dogs Bill has some indirect reference to the Butter Bill. I do not know whether that is so, but if it be so, it is possible, now that the Butter Bill is condemned, that the dogs may receive more favour at our hands.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Give us the Butter Bill and drop the Dogs.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Another Bill is the County Courts Bill, in the progress of which my hon. friend the Member for South Islington takes an interest. There was a private Bill last year dealing with County Courts. It was not a Government Bill in its original shape. I do not know that it received much favour from the Law Officers of the Crown. It went to another place, and was there amended, but without a subsidiary Bill it was, in the opinion of those competent to judge, not a really workable measure. The date upon which it should come into operation was postponed until January, 1905. It is not convenient to have another Act coming into operation shorn of some of the provisions necessary to make it a workable measure. But if it cannot be passed without any expenditure of time I shall not press it on the House. I do not know whether the Secretary for Scotland is sanguine about the Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Scotland)

Bill; but that, again, may probably receive the approval of the Scotch Members and without commentary it can pass. It remains now to deal with whales. I do not mean the portion of the United Kingdom, but the inhabitants of the deep—w-h-a-l-e-s. I understand that there is a Scotch Bill which has been passed in the Lords dealing with these interesting denizens of the deep, and I am told that it is uncontroversial and accepted by every one. I am not competent to explain its provisions, but it belongs to that class which by consent may pass, but without consent cannot pass. This, then, is the analysis of the contents of the obligatory list, and the House will feel that the time is quite adequate to deal with it without serious inconvenience and without throwing any undue burden on the patience of hon. Members. Its fulfilment does not rest wholly with the Government, but I do not see why we should not adjourn at the end of next week or shortly afterwards. I hope that the Supplementary Estimates will be taken to-day.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): What about the Constabulary (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. FLAVIN: It died long ago.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Constabulary (Ireland) Bill is not one which I have down on my list, but I will endeavour to make myself acquainted with its position.

Mr. BUCHANAN [(Perthshire, E.)]: Are there any Army or Navy Supplementary Estimates ?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted, except at half-past Seven of the clock at an Afternoon Sitting, under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put."—(*Mr. A J. Balfour.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I have seldom listened to a statement of this kind less sensational in its character than that just made by the right hon. Gentleman. He has accepted the situation, but still I think he was permeated by the sanguine spirit which always prevades Ministers in charge of Bills, because the list of so-called small Bills for the most part of an unknown kind, which the right hon. Gentleman thinks not beyond hope, is rather greater than it is possible to fulfil. I will venture to supplement the list which the right hon. Gentleman has read by reading a list of the Bills promised in the King's Speech. There was the Aliens Bill. [Ministerial cheers.] Apparently hon. Members wish something to be said about that, and I will say it. It was a perfectly impracticable and hopeless measure. It practically put into the power of a Customs-house officer, and made it part of his duty, to tell who was respectable and who was not, who was likely to be prosperous and who was not, among all the promiscuous people landed from a ship. That was in itself enough to condemn the measure apart from the higher principles with which it dealt. The Government refused to give effect to the one provision which would have been open to no objection, and which would have a real effect in deterring the landing or in expelling undesirable characters who refuse to go. The next Bill was the Licensing Bill. That has gone to another place with all its sins and merits on its head. Let us say no more of it just now. The Valuation Bill has been much criticised and it now disappears. There is the Education (Scotland) Bill, and I regret that the House has not succeeded in passing it this year. But it was an unusually complicated and elaborate measure, and it was made more complicated when, in obedience to the suggestion of an hon. Member opposite the Government raised the thorny question of rating. That was a controversial question, the introduction of which almost brought the seeds of death with it. The right hon. Gentleman has attributed to me a preference for procedure by Grand Committee. I do not know that I ever said so, but I do say that if the right hon. Gentleman thinks that he would satisfy the people of Scotland or the

Opposition by bringing in a Bill of this kind next year, and by sending it to an ordinary Grand Committee, he is entirely mistaken. Like the right hon. Gentleman, I have great faith in his own countrymen, if they are left to themselves. But what alone would be satisfactory in regard to the reintroduction of the Scottish Education Bill would be either its full discussion in Committee of the Whole House, or its reference to a Committee almost entirely composed of Scottish Members, who would not be liable to be overruled by the votes of English, Welsh, and Irish Members. I have thought it right to say that in order to guard myself against the suggestion that I should approve the reference of the Bill another year to a mere Grand Committee. The Irish Labourers Bill is gone; the Workmen's Compensation Bill has not been introduced; the Public Health Bill is a very small measure; the Naval Prize Bill is gone with the Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill and the Sea Fisheries Bill; though the Shop Hours Bill seems to be in a hopeful condition. There remains one measure among those mentioned in the King's Speech of which nothing has been heard—the Re-election of Ministers Bill. Probably that re-election has become more doubtful than it was at the beginning of the session. I do not wonder at it. Election without the "re" seems to have no attraction for the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman is under a slight mistake. That Bill did not apply to this Parliament at all.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: In that case the benefit is to be postponed to the dim and distant period to which the fiscal question has been relegated. Of Bills not included in the King's Speech there are the Defaulting Education Authorities Bill, the Dogs Bill, the Penal Servitude Bill, and the Police Superannuation Bill. There is another small but at this time of the year dangerous category of Bills—namely, those dropped down suddenly not from heaven but from the Lords. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will assure the House that no controversial Bill will be sprung on the House from that direction. There is not much criticism to pass on the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, which frankly accepts the situation. It is evident that, except for the Licensing Bill, this has been a most unfruitful session. So far as the Government are responsible for the general conduct of business, they cannot regard the future of their Bills as affording any satisfaction or credit to them; but they have the credit at least of accepting the accomplished fact, and of not attempting to force on against the obvious feeling of the House measures which would have no real chance of passing.

***SIR CHARLES DILKE** (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the right hon. Gentleman took credit to himself at the beginning of his speech for not having suspended the Twelve O'clock Rule earlier in the session, but the reason that the general suspension of the Twelve O'clock Rule had been postponed so long was only because the Finance Bill, which had occupied so much of the recent time of the House, was exempt from the operation of the Rule. It was practically suspended on the Licensing Bill under the closure Resolution. The House wss now asked to sit late to pass a large number of unusually controversial Bills. The Defaulting Authorities Bill would undoubtedly cause a struggle, and that was put down for Friday's sitting, of which the termination might be Monday. The Wireless Telegraphy Bill would require long discussion, and the County Courts Bill was far from non-controversial. Its effect was to repeal to a large extent the Act of last year, which extended the jurisdiction of the County Court Judges over the whole country. He believed that the only objection to it arose from a feeling on the part of some of the Judges that their salaries ought to be increased on account of the additional work that would be cast upon them. He certainly could not see any objection to the Bill coming into operation on 1st January next, for he believed it would work perfectly well, and the difficulty as to salaries could be provided for in the Estimates. One remarkable fact was that the session had been entirely barren of Labour legislation; for the Shop Hours Bill did not carry out the Resolution of the House passed last year. It had become, in fact, a Shopkeepers Bill and not a Labour Bill. He agreed that the Aliens Bill was an utterly impracticable measure. Some hon. Members on the Conservative side imagined that it was urgently desired by the working classes, but in that they were very much mistaken. The working classes in these matters listened to the advice of two sets of men who were intellectually their leaders—Socialists of various types ranging from the extreme to the moderate, and the old trades unionists—and both those classes were entirely opposed to the Bill. Then there was the question of the Amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Act. It had been suggested that delay in dealing with that matter was due to an inquiry which had been held and to the recent receipt of certain reports from County Court Judges and others. All he could say was that there was no excuse for the delay; the inquiry could have been held years since and the reports were asked for three or four years ago. The Bill, in fact, ought to have been introduced last year.

The Government had wasted a great deal of time this session by introducing and pottering over Bills for a day or two and then deciding not to proceed with them. When they heard that the Scotch Education Bill was to be dropped they remembered that the Scotch Members failed to attend the Ascot race meeting, at which they were no doubt all anxious to be present, in order that progress might be made with that measure. There were about a dozen smaller Bills which had been introduced, and over which a certain amount of time had been wasted. The Penal Servitude Bill was only one of them. Another Bill, which he thought was to be the principal Bill of the session, was the Irish Labourers Bill. Last year in the discussions on the Irish Land Bill that measure was promised to the Irish Members in terms so strong that it seemed to him that it was to be made the principal measure of the session. At the beginning of the session he was somewhat astonished it did not occupy that position. It was the fifth in the King's Speech, and it had been abandoned without any serious attempt to pass it through the House. It was undoubtedly a fact that Bills which might have passed through the Standing Committees had not been sent to them, and that Bills had been sent to them—such as the Aliens Bill—which ought not to have been sent. These Bills had been allowed to wreck, or rather to jeopardise, the very institution of the Standing Committees, because whenever Bills of the wrong kind were sent to the Standing Committees the effect was a breakdown of the Standing Committee system. It seemed to him also that there had been a great waste of time during the present session in connection with Bills which were introduced year after year. Some of them had figured on the programme for four years. These Bills tended to clog the Order Paper, and were used for preventing other measures from being carried through. The Bishopric of Southwark Bill and the Bishopric of Bristol Bill were measures from last year on which a certain amount of time had been wasted by the House, but there had been no really serious attempt to proceed with them. They were only allowed to stand in one another's way and to waste time. There had been no serious attempt to proceed with the Port of London Bill, and they ought not to have wasted time upon it last year and this.

The moral to be drawn was that it was useless for Members of the House to press for additional Ministries—for example, to divide the Board of Trade into a Ministry of Commerce and a Ministry of Labour — if the Bills produced by the Departments were to be allowed to jostle one another without any intelligible scheme on which they should be proceeded with. The outstanding Supply was likely to keep them up after twelve o'clock on those nights, because Supply had been allowed to fall into arrear in respect of important Departments which must be discussed. Time had been wasted day after day in the early part of the session, and some of the Supply days had been allowed to finish improperly about seven o'clock. Some of the Votes included in Class I. were discussed year after year, and the time which had been not very usefully devoted to them prevented the consideration of other Votes which were really important and ought to have been discussed. They had spent this year a good many days on Army Supply, but these days were substantially wasted because the Government had not then put forward their Army scheme. Now they had to discuss the really important points of the Army scheme at a period of the session when they had not time to discuss them adequately. They had not this session had proper time for the discussion of the Labour Votes. The Clothing Vote was one in connection with which there had been gross scandals. Promises had been made in this House to Members who took part in former debates, and these promises had not been carried out. Many in this House ought to have been allowed to express their opinion on it. Now the Prime Minister stated that there would be no further War Office Supplementary Estimate, although within the past few days they were told that there would be a Supplementary Estimate for the expense of the war in Somaliland. He confessed he could not understand the discrepancy in the two statements. That was a matter that must be probed by the House. The moral they had to derive from that was that there was no proper arrangement of the business of the House. There was an immense waste of time in the early part of the session in Supply, and in other ways, due to no fault of the House itself. There were many matters which had not been brought before the House up to the present time. They were matters which hon. Members desired to discuss, but they would not now have the opportunity of doing so because valuable time had been wasted early in the session.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he wished to join in the general complaint made by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. He agreed with the right hon. Baronet that Supply had not been managed in such a way as to enable the House to raise the various questions of policy which ought to have been raised. There were still fourteen Reports of Supply remaining to be considered. He was afraid that arose from attempting to rescue these Reports of Supply from consideration after twelve o'clock. With regard to the general question of Supply, he must say that he regretted that the Government had not found themselves able to entertain the recommendation that an Estimates Committee should be formed and that a day should be allocated for the reception of the Public Accounts Committee. A question of peculiar gravity was raised by the Motion now before the House. The Motion said "That, for the remainder of the session, Government business be not interrupted except at half-past seven of the clock at an afternoon sitting, under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the sittings of the House." He did not object to that portion of it, but he thought it was really unfair to ask the House to agree to this sentence, "and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; and that at the conclusion of Government business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put." He thought the Government should not pass that part of the Motion, because under it extremely important business might be entered upon after twelve o'clock in circumstances when it ought not to be taken up. His right hon. friend, with charming cynicism or forgetfulness, was pleased to say that private Members were never so well off. When he himself came into the House they had three-fifths of the time, and the Bills and Motions they brought forward were excellently debated. Now private Members had barely one-tenth of the whole time of the House.

An important piece of business which might come on after twelve o'clock was a Motion to be proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer which would eventuate no doubt in the giving of borrowing powers. That was a very serious matter. For something like twenty years, or more, whenever the Government wanted a million or two, they had recourse to the Savings Banks. But that source of supply had now, for the first time, failed. That was a very grave fact, and the consideration of it ought not to begin after one o'clock. Then taking the Cunard agreement, which was entered into in September, 1902. From that day, it had not been put before the House till the very last day of the session last year, when there were only ninety-two supporters of the Government present. He did not think it was creditable that an agreement involving the expenditure of seven millions of money should have been put forward for ratification, and did receive ratification, on the last day of the session. He should oppose a Motion to finance the Cunard Company to the extent of £6,900,000 with all the energy of which he was capable. As to wireless telegraphy, that was a subject of very great importance. It raised very nice and complicated questions, and was not a subject which ought to be raised after one o'clock in the morning. Then he came to the Anglo-French Convention. That raised very important matters indeed, especially under present circumstances. Had the House forgotten that the French Assembly had refused to ratify the Convention until the Autumn ? That subject ought not to be entered upon after one o'clock in the morning. He congratulated his right hon. friend in having postponed the Undersized Fish Bill, and he hoped that the Whales Bill had no connection with it. Then there was the question of Naval Prizes—which was most important. So far as it went it was highly desirable to do what it purported to do, and he was in favour of it; but it would be necessary to discuss the question whether the provisions of the Bill should not be extended so as to deal with Military booty. These were all questions the discussion of which ought not to be begun after one o'clock in the morning. It seemed to him that, with these exceptions, the Resolution of the Government was a perfectly proper one, and one which he hoped the House would pass.

MR. BUCHANAN said that his hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn had, for once in a way, made his forecast rightly. Almost all these Bills would come on after twelve o'clock, and most of them after one o'clock in the morning. If Thursday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday were to be occupied with Supply, and no other business could be taken until after twelve o'clock, there was a fundamental objection to closing the business of the session at the time proposed. There was a claim, therefore, for extending the session by an additional three days. Tuesday and Wednesday would be two guillotine nights, and the whole of these Bills would have to be taken after twelve o'clock, and many of them at a much later hour. He joined with his hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn in his protest against that. He appealed to the Prime Minister whether the right hon. Gentleman could not make arrangements by which the discussion on these Bills, which were of great importance, involving great questions of policy, could not be begun at an earlier hour. There was the Bill to be introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, providing for a new method for borrowing money under the Naval and Military Works Acts. That was a Bill of the highest importance, of which they knew nothing, but which in all probability would have to be discussed after twelve o'clock. He did not think that was a fair way of treating the important questions involved in these Bills. Then, there were other Bills which had not yet been introduced, or at any rate had not come before the House. There was one in connection with the Army Council which involved very considerable alterations in the law, and very considerable constitutional questions indeed. He put it to the Prime Minister, was it not perfectly clear that no final conclusion could be arrived at as to the alterations and amendments in our Army system laid before them at this late period of the session by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War, and whether it would not be wiser to postpone this Bill and other Departmental Bills connected with the War Office till another opportunity.

Mr. Gibson Bowles.

He would like to press the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the Somaliland Supplementary Estimates. The Prime Minister told the House a few days ago that these Supplementary Estimates were going to be presented; but the only Estimates were in regard to half-a-dozen Civil Service Votes, and not one in regard to the Military expenditure in Somaliland. How did the Government propose to meet the expenditure which had been incurred in Somaliland, and which the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House would have to be met in the course of the present financial year ? Or was it an oversight that the Prime Minister took no notice of that in the course of his speech ? Then there were the Bills relating to Scotland. He thought the Prime Minister had taken the only course in regard to the Scotch

Education Bill. It was a Bill which needed discussion. He believed that if there had been an opportunity for its being fully discussed, it would have passed, and would have given general satisfaction to Scotland. If he might say so, he thought that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had, in his desire to conciliate opposition, very considerably improved the Bill; and he had not the slightest doubt that if the Bill were introduced again they would have a better Bill than that now before the House, and one which would be still more satisfactory to the people of Scotland after full consideration had been given to it in the country during the recess. Then if only ten minutes were devoted to the Prisons Bill and the Reformatories Bill they could easily be passed. There was one branch of the policy of the present Government of which he had always approved, viz., that relating to dogs. There was a Bill relating to sheep-worrying, for the discussion of which he earnestly hoped some time would be found so as to enable the Government to pass it into law.

He wanted to say one or two words on the subject of the opportunities which private Members had for the discussion of grievances. The Prime Minister took credit to himself that the rights of private Members had never been infringed upon in the present Parliament. He believed, with the hon. Member for King's Lynn, that these rights were now of an extremely limited character. Still they gave to private Members some limited opportunity of raising questions of general and provincial importance, in which large sections of the community were vitally interested. The Prime Minister showed himself somewhat blind to the fact that that was, after all, one of the most important duties of the House of Commons: that it should constitute the means by which the representatives of the constituencies should have ample opportunity for bringing before the House and the public a free discussion of subjects which were vitally interesting to their constituents, and which might be coming on for legislation, though they had not yet arrived at that point. That time had been largely reduced. There was another way in which the rights of private Members had been limited, and that was by the new and increasing practice of blocking Motions. That prevented private Members discussing subjects of vast importance, and particularly of sudden importance. The Prime Minister had shown himself anything but adverse to such a practice.

There was another practice in regard to Supply which was alluded to by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. He did not think that the right hon. Baronet had put the matter strongly enough in referring to what they had been doing this session with the allotted days for Supply in the course of the discussions on the Army Estimates in the early part of the session. He did not agree with the right hon. Baronet when he said that these days had been wasted in the sense the right hon. Baronet implied. Then as to the apportionment of the time of the allotted days for which the Leader of the House was alone responsible, they had had eighteen allotted days, but only on four was the House enabled to discuss Supply at the afternoon and evening sittings. On three occasions the adjournment of the House was moved at half-past seven by the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, which deprived the House of the opportunity of discussing important matters at the evening sittings. On one occasion, the attendance was scant; but it was the duty of the Government to keep a House on these occasions; and they should not have informal and secret arrangements which were not stated openly to the House. Even from their own point of view, the bargain was a bad one for the Government, as only on one occasion did they get the required number of Votes. On eleven other nights, the House did not enjoy the complete time because contentious private Bills were put down; and on five or six occasions all the evening sitting was taken up in private business. Private Bills were put down on the authority of the Chairman of Ways and Means, who, no doubt, exercised his authority in accordance with the Standing Orders; but there was nothing in the Standing Orders directing the Chairman of Ways and Means to put down private Bills on allotted days. He thought that the Leader of the House, who was responsible for the proper conduct of business, and the adequate discussion of Supply, ought to take some notice of the fact that contentious private Bills were almost exclusively put down on allotted days. He thought the Government should share the burden of private Bill legislation with the rest of the House; and contentious private Bills should be discussed on Government days as well as on allotted days. He thought it right to lay these facts before the House; and he hoped that in future sessions they would have a better opportunity of discharging one of their primary and essential duties, namely, the proper discussion of Supply.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said he should like to express to the President of the Local Government Board the regret of the municipal authorities that the Valuation Bill was included in the list of Bills to be withdrawn. A proper system of valuation was the very pivot on which good local administration rested; and, with the exception of London, the position of which was exceptional, he was quite satisfied that the country generally was in favour of the principle of the Bill, namely, one central authority with good and adequately represented district authorities to secure adequate local information and representation. After the question had been discussed for fifty years, and after it had been reported on by a Royal Commission, he hoped that at no distant date the Bill would be proceeded with. Objection had been taken to the surveyor of taxes as representing the Crown; but that had worked well in practice, and it would enable Government property to be properly assessed. As a London Member he expressed regret at the withdrawal of the Port of London Bill, which was urgently required in the interests of the Port of London. It was supported by the great body of commercial opinion, and was opposed chiefly by the Members for the City of London. He appealed to the Prime Minister to regard the withdrawal of the Bill as provisional; and he hoped that a Motion would be passed carrying the Bill over to next session as he himself suggested, and as was done last session. He rose chiefly to refer to the County Courts Bill. He did not think that the Prime Minister had quite accurately represented the ground on which words were inserted in last year's Act postponing its operation for one year. That was consented to not because the Bill was not workable; but in order to enable those who said it was not workable to have an opportunity of finding out in what way it was unworkable, and to provide a remedy. Those who supported the Bill never admitted that there was any obstacle whatever in carrying out the clause which provided for an increase in the jurisdiction of all County Courts up to £100, the only clause in the Bill as introduced. This year's Bill, however, instead of suggesting administrative and financial provisions and facilities, as promised, actually repealed the Act of last year, and then gave to only some of the County Courts increased jurisdiction, such Courts to be selected by the Lord Chancellor and not being named in the Bill. The Bill would encourage actions in the High Court by also omitting the reference made in the Act of last session to Clause 116 of the County Courts Act, thus removing the sanction of risk of costs. He quite agreed that there were some additional reforms which might well be effected.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman will not be in order in discussing the County Courts Bill.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT said he would not discuss the matter further; but the responsibility for the rejection of the Bill rested with those who introduced it at such a late period of the session. He would, however, be very pleased to confer with the Attorney-General as to how the Bill might be amended; but he certainly could not agree to it as it stood or to the repeal of the Act of last session; and in fact most of what was proposed could be effected by rules and resolutions and increased remuneration to judges, according to their work, after experience, and upon the Estimates. The Shops Bill would not meet with universal assent, as many thought it did not go far enough, while others thought it would operate against the small trader especially those not employing assistants, who had work enough to live on. He would support the Resolution, although he thought the measures had been withdrawn which might have been passed, and that measures were to be passed which might have been withdrawn.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said, according to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister there were fourteen Bills that must be carried, and he would like the House to consider the time allowed for this programme. This week the right hon. Gentleman only had two-thirds of a day, Friday, for legislation; next week he would not have a single day. With the Indian Budget and Supply there would not be a single day for legislation next week until after twelve o'clock. All of those Bills, important Bills, would have to be passed after twelve o'clock or the House would be thrown into the third week in August, when everybody would be thoroughly tired and exhausted except those who were opposing the measures. And the animus of some of the Opposition towards some of these measures would keep the House sitting for some time. Under those conditions it was rather important to consider those Bills which the right hon. Gentleman had dropped, and contrast them with those he was going to proceed with. The right hon. Gentleman was going to drop the Port of London Bill, a Bill undoubtedly important for the commerce of the greatest port in the Empire, the greatest port in the world. The mere fact that the Bill had been suspended had created a great deal of trouble with the trade of this country, and yet it was going to be again suspended! In the interest of the trade of the country, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, it was not worth giving an extra couple of days to pass this Bill into law. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to drop the Valuation Bill. That such a Bill was necessary nobody would deny; the country had waited for it for many years, and a Royal Commission had sat upon the question and had reported. Everybody wanted one valuation authority, and the Bill was produced as a result of the Report of the Committee. The valuation question was a question of the most enormous importance—yet it was to be put upon one side, because the right hon. Gentleman would not give a little time for the passing of a Bill. A Workmans Compensation Bill had been promised in the King's Speech, and no one would deny but what that was a matter of great importance to hundreds of thousands of working men in the country, but no day was to be given to that. There was the False Statements Bill, as to which a pledge was given on its introduction. Then there was the Scotch Education Bill, a Bill to vary the educational measures of Scotland, which was so received by the House on its introduction that no one thought fit to go to a division upon it. It had been thoroughly considered up to the thirty-first clause, and now it was to be dropped. It was a Bill the Government thought necessary to reorganise the education of Scotland, it received a great deal of support in the House, and if not carried now would no doubt cause a great deal of inconvenience, because, as he understood, it would suspend the equivalent grant yet no time had been given for it.

Let the House now consider the Bills which were to be passed. The right hon. Gentleman was going through with the Defaulting Authorities Bill and the Bishopric of Birmingham Bill. There were two elements which no doubt the right hon. Gentleman thought sufficient to command his support in the latter Bill. One was that it was a Bishops' Bill and the other that it was a Birmingham Bill. Those were two Bills he was going to give time to, and both of them would take time. What was there in those two Bills to merit the right hon. Gentleman putting on one side Bills affecting the commerce, the working men, the local government, and valuation of the country? What was there in those Bills that the House of Commons at the fag end of the session should give its time, and sit after twelve o'clock, for the purpose of forcing them through the House. Why should that be done? There was trouble with regard to one Welsh county council, a trouble that was in process of solution at the present moment, and which would be probably settled in the course of a week, and yet the Defaulting Authorities Bill was to be forced through. The right hon. Gentleman had said it was a Bill with a central idea. That was true of all Bills; it was true of the Licensing Bill, which was a Bill the one idea of which was to compensate publicans. This was a Bill with one main idea. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean to indicate by that that very drastic measures were to be taken to rush this Bill through the House? He would ask the right hon. Gentleman quite seriously before he came to such a decision—this was a Bill which would cause a great deal of irritation and opposition—was it right that the right hon. Gentleman should add to that irritation, and prejudice the prospect of that settlement in Wales and Yorkshire, by resorting to means of this character, which would induce the people to believe that he meant to give no opportunity for discussing it. Was that what they were going to sit late for, to sit after twelve o'clock for, and to sit late into August—simply to discuss a Bill of that character when there were important measures placed upon one side? It was a great comment on the methods of the Government, and upon the pressure which the Government obeyed rather than consider the commerce of the country. The right hon. Gentleman said this Bill must go through. Who were they who said it "must"? It was not the "must" that arose out of any real need of the country—it was simply a political "must." The brewers "must" put through the Licensing Bill and the Bishops "must" in other cases. This was treating the House of Commons unfairly. The House ought not at this period of the session to be asked to pass through any measures except those of absolute necessity. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the Cunard agreement must be passed, because he had entered into a contract. Was the reason why he was going to pass the Defaulting Authorities Bill, that he had also entered into a contract with regard to it, and so must go through with it? If so, the House ought to see that contract as they saw the Cunard contract. Then there was the Butter Bill and the Dogs Bill. Those were Bills in the interest of agriculture. The Dogs Bill, one would suppose, was a Bill that the Government would desire most to pass. It was a Bill to prevent a masterless dog from worrying the flock; these suffering dogs were to be treated in this Bill as dangerous. That was surely a much more interesting Bill than the Defaulting Authorities Bill, which if passed would only raise a storm of indignation in the country and cause intense irritation. He submitted that in this case the Government were treating the House and the country most unfairly.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) thought that the position with regard to the County Courts Bill should be fully explained. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean had suggested that that Bill would not have been necessary if it had not been that certain County Court Judges wanted their salaries increased.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he did not suggest that it was an improper thing for the County Court Judges to want their salaries increased, but that the Bill would throw a great deal of extra work upon them, and it was not unnatural that they should desire an increase of salary.

MR. GALLOWAY said it should be made perfectly clear that the Bill was not introduced for that purpose. With regard to the Port of the London Bill, he would like to know whether it was to be dropped or to be carried forward in its present stage to next session by a Resolution. With regard to private Bill legislation he found himself in a somewhat peculiar position. It was not his wont to ask for facilities for private Bills, but he asked for the indulgence of the House on this occasion whilst he pleaded for some further facilities for the Musical Copyright Bill which was of great interest to his constituents. It was a Bill that won the first place in the ballot, and was a Bill which was regarded more as a Departmental than a private Bill. A very great grievance was suffered by numberless people who had done nothing to forfeit the sympathy of the House and who had every right to claim its protection in the enjoyment of the privileges they possessed. He felt sure if the right hon. Gentleman would give a little time after twleve o'clock, when the Government business was over, an agreement might be come to, and the Bill become law. In doing so the right hon. Gentleman would only be doing an act of justice to a number of people who were now being robbed of their property. He appealed to his right hon. friend to give time for this measure.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he desired to endorse what had fallen from one or two previous speakers and to express his regret at the fate that had overtaken the Port of London Bill. It was a question of great interest to many Londoners. The position of the Government with regard to this Bill was the same as their position with regard to many others. This Bill was the result of a Royal Commission appointed a few years ago; that Royal Commission itself being the outcome of a Bill promoted by the dock companies. The Commission reported in a comparatively brief space of time, and this Bill was introduced in the previous session to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The Bill having passed a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons came on on Report at an early stage of the session, yet not a single day was to be given to it. Had a couple of days been given to it last session it could have been passed and would now have been law. He contended that the Government had no right to carry this Bill over last session if they did not intend to carry it through in the present session. The action of the Government during the last two years had paralysed the trade of the Port of London and their conduct for the last four years had caused great injury to the Port of London itself. The right hon. Gentleman had said the opposition to this Bill arose from Metropolitan Members. To whom did the right hon. Gentleman refer. So far as the Metropolitan Members on the Liberal side were concerned, whether they thought it was a good Bill or not, they were prepared to give favourable consideration to it and not object to its passage. If the right hon. Gentleman would look into this matter he would find that the opposition to this Bill came from the Unionist side, and the Unionist side alone. It was opposed by the two hon. Members for the City, and by the hon. Member for Uxbridge, representing the Thames Conservancy. Under these circumstances he thought the House ought to have had an opportunity of considering the measure. It was not fair to the trade and commerce of the City of London that a Bill of this importance should be hung up for two sessions without a single attempt being made to discuss it. The real blame for the matter lay with the Government and not with the House, and he could only express his regret that the Government did not attempt to pass a Bill of this importance into law. By raising the question without settling it they had seriously damaged the trade of the Port of London.

The Aliens Bill had been introduced and dropped by the Government. A great deal of political capital had been made out of the dropping of that Bill by the Government. He himself was generally in favour of the Bill, but he was sorry to have to admit that he had come to the conclusion, looking at the matter from all sides, that the Government were never in earnest with regard to that Bill; that it was only a shop-window Bill, and that it was never intended to be passed. In that case the Government had most flagrantly broken their pledges. Nearly ten years ago they had pledged themselves to deal with this matter, and the late Lord Salisbury actually introduced a Bill on the question and passed it through another House. This was the first Bill mentioned in the King's Speech as a principal measure and one would have thought it would have been retained in the House, but it was referred to a Grand Committee. He did not think Grand Committees were ever created to deal with Bills of this character. It could hardly be contended on behalf of the Government that they were entitled to send up their principal Bill of the session to a Committee of eighty-two Members, and he could only assume that it was never intended that that Bill should be passed.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said that among the Bills that were not to be dropped was the Irish Judicature and Development Grant Bill. It was included in the category of uncontroversial measures, but when it came to be dealt with, if ever it did, he thought that the right hon. Gentleman would find it was anything but uncontroversial.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said there were three full days remaining for

Supply and he wished to ask the Prime Minister what Supply he proposed to take upon those days. He also desired to express his regret that the Scotch Education Bill was to be dropped. A great deal of interest had been shown in it, and many public bodies in Scotland had communicated with their representatives in Parliament in regard to that measure. The right hon. Gentleman had promised to introduce it next session, but they did not know whether a favourable opportunity would arise. He wished to say that if the Bill was introduced again next session that no Grand Committee would be satisfactory to the Scotch Members unless every Scotch Member was allowed to be upon that Committee. With regard to the Port of London Bill, he wished to know whether it would be possible to carry it over to the next session as was done last year. It was a measure well worthy of consideration, and it was one of very great importance to the commercial community and many regrets had been expressed because it had not been proceeded with. What had the harvest of this session been? It had practically been one Bill, and that was the only sheaf that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to bear on his shoulders, namely, the Licensing Bill. It was a great measure of temperance reform, and it was a very remarkable Bill because it had been passed against the wishes of temperance reformers. Another point worth mentioning was in regard to the failure of the new Rules of Procedure. The result of this had been that hon. Members had been obliged to come down to the House at an inconvenient hour, whilst the time had been mostly spent by supporters of the Government attempting to put off divisions. He thought the new rules had not improved either the quantity or the quality of the legislation the session. That was the result of the new Rules of Procedure which the House passed after such a large expenditure of time and trouble. If the House wished to do its business properly they would have to have some better Rules of Procedure.

SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London) reminded the Prime Minister that in answer to a Question put by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet, he stated last year that the Port of London Bill would be carried over as a quasi-private Bill. It might be called a quasi-private Bill, but it was absolutely a public Bill and a very important one. It was brought in by the President of the Board of Trade and carried through the House of Commons extremely quickly, but upon the distinct understanding that they would be afforded a further opportunity of discussing it fully. He had listened with feelings akin to amazement at what the hon. Member for Poplar had said in regard to the trade of the Port of London being paralysed. Was the hon. Member aware that the last twelve months was an absolute record in the Port of London in regard to the trade transacted, and even during the last six months the record was a better one than the corresponding six months of last year. This Bill was rushed through the House of Commons and sent to a Joint Committee of the Houses of Lords and Commons, and that Committee sat for fourteen days only. And this was how a Bill, involving the entire system of docks in the Port of London, the Thames Conservancy, and the compulsory purchase of docks and undertakings aggregating to some £40,000,000 sterling, a charge which was to be thrown upon the rates of London, was treated. The hon. Member for Poplar said the Committee took a large amount of evidence, but surely this was not a Bill to hang up from session to session. He ventured to say that day by day and week by week the feeling was growing stronger and stronger that this was an impossible Bill. There were other schemes possible, such as the Barrage Scheme, which ought to be considered before £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 was thrown as a charge upon the shoulders of the ratepayers of the Metropolis. He understood that the Prime Minister had dropped this Bill. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that the general feeling of the Metropolitan Members was against the Port of London Bill, and in the City of London there was a growing feeling that the measure was not one which ought to pass. As to the memorials which had been referred to, he thought they could easily find where they had emanated from, and a good many of them, he was inclined to think, had emanated from one source only.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said he did not think anyone would deny that the House found itself in a very inconvenient position that afternoon, and whilst in that inconvenient position it was confronted with a very inconvenient demand. The demand now made upon the time of the House was a demand which it was usual for the Leader of the House to make at this period of the session. It might be asked on what ground was it justifiable to offer opposition to a usual demand for which there were excellent precedents. Any justification for voting against this Motion was to be found, not so much in the nature of the demand, but from the general circumstances of the session, which had been unusual in their character, and those circumstances had changed a usual demand into a very unusual demand. He did not understand why there was this imperative need of finishing discussions in the House by the 15th or 16th of August. Only two reasons had been put forward why they should close their discussions upon such a date. One of the reasons was a matter of common chaff, and it was that there was a certain sacred bird to be killed on the 12th of August, and hon. Gentlemen opposite were impatient to get away to undertake its destruction. The other reason was put forward by *The Times* newspaper, that they could not sit later than 17th August, because on that date the Prime Minister had to deliver an address before the British Association. He did not think the House would find in those two reasons any sufficient cause for submitting Members of the House to a great deal of inconvenience, still less any sufficient reason for wishing them to scamp duties which were important in the interests of the country.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen had alluded to the scanty harvest which the Prime Minister had reaped that session, and it must have occurred to everyone who had listened to the universal chorus of complaints which had been directed against the Prime Minister from both sides of the House that this had been a most miserable session, a most barren, worthless, squalid, futile, and profitless session. They had voted £140,000,000 for the expenditure of the country; they had passed the Licensing Bill, which would secure the brewer's vote at the election, and they were about to pass another Bill which would annoy the Principality of Wales. But apart from those important achievements no legislation of value, no administrative action of importance, had been expounded and made clear in the House. The only subject on which there had been any considerable discussion was the Finance Bill, and that was explained by the fact that our finances were in a condition of entire demoralisation and it was absolutely necessary that some protest should be made against the great size of the annual Budget and the increase of expenditure. He much regretted that the Prime Minister had not been able to do what he half promised to do, namely, give a day, or some period, for the discussion of the Report of the National Expenditure Committee. What was the good of having such Committees, with all their attendant labour and expense, if absolutely no notice was to be taken of their Reports? The right hon. Gentleman, of course, would not be able to give them any time now, but he would ask him to remember that this Committee was appointed on his own Motion, and that it was intended to set up machinery supplementary and complementary to his own new Rules of Procedure, and that in regard to the recommendations which it had made, although some were only carried by a small majority, the great mass of them were carried practically unanimously. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman, in preparing for the campaign in the autumn, would endeavour to make some proposal of machinery which would enable the House to make something like effective examination of the Votes in Supply.

The Prime Minister had divided the Bills up into three classes—dead Bills, doubtful Bills, and Bills which must at all costs be made to live. He desired also to divide the work of the session into three categories; firstly, the legislation which had been put forward for show; secondly, legislation which the House wanted and which the Government did not want; and, thirdly, legislation which the Government wanted and which the House did not want. In the first of these classes, of course, the Port of London Bill figured as a noteworthy example. Then there was the Valuation Bill, and he was not sure that the Irish Labourers Bill was not introduced for show. But the greatest example of this first class of legislation was the Aliens Bill. When this Bill was under discussion he ventured to point out to the Prime Minister that he must know from his own views on the subject that this was not the sort of Bill for Grand Committee, and the sending of it to Grand Committee was practically signing its death warrant. He ventured to say then, and he said it again, that the Government was not in earnest about that Bill, and did not desire to pass it. They only brought it forward in order to have an opportunity of saying they wished to deal with the subject, and in order to satisfy a demand made by those who were behind them. A variety of forces had acted upon the Government in regard to the Aliens Bill. His hon. and gallant friend the Member for Sheffield had all his life been advocating this kind of legislation; there were those associated with the protectionist movement who thought it akin to their general line of political thought; and there was in his own Party opposition from wealthy Jewish supporters—very proper opposition—and consequently the Prime Minister was forced to choose between the different conflicting forces. The Government decided to make a show, and on the very first excuse made haste to drop it. Not only did they drop the main Bill, but also another Bill which was introduced by the hon. and gallant Member, with a sort of tacit agreement with all those interested in the subject—a Bill dealing with criminal aliens alone. The Government allowed their followers—he might almost say instigated their followers, although perhaps that was rather a strong word—to block the Bill night after night. Of course it had no chance whatever of passing into law. If in the course of the autumn recess hon. Gentlemen opposite should have their houses burgled by foreign criminals, who dumped themselves on our shores in competition with our existing industries, it would be upon the Prime Minister's head and upon the heads of the members of his Government that public indignation should properly fall.

As to the second class of Bills which the House wanted and the Government did not want, there was the Bill of his hon. friend the Member for the Elland Division, dealing with the taxation of land values. That was a Bill which the Government did not dare to resist, and it was passed by a large majority of the House, with the assent of nearly all the great municipalities of the country. There was the Trade Union Bill, which had for its object to amend the law relating to trade unions. It had a preponderating and, he ventured to think, a decisive volume of public support in the country. That again was a Bill which the Government did not dare to resist and it was carried in the House by a large majority, but in spite of urgent appeals from the members of the Labour Party and Members like the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean, who had given these questions long and careful study, the Government had refused to give the smallest possible facilities, and the responsibility for refusing to deal with the labour problem rested absolutely with them.

The third class of Bills were those which the Government desired to pass and which, he thought, the House was reluctant to assent to. In that class was the Bill in which the hon. Member for Carnarvon was interested. There was also the Licensing Bill, which was now under discussion in another place. What a difference in the treatment of those Bills which were conceived in the interest of the right hon. Gentleman's Party and the Bills conceived in the general interest of labour. In the one case absolutely no facilities; in the other no restraint of any kind in the application of the most drastic form of closure and the absolute twisting and destruction of the ordinary procedure of the House. He thought the last instance, the guillotining of the Licensing Bill, alone supplied a reason why they should not this afternoon endeavour to go out of their way to convenience the Government. He heard a most distinguished Member of the

House say, in connection with the procedure the Prime Minister had adopted in connection with the Licensing Bill, that it was nothing short of declaring war against the House of Commons and would justify reprisals of the most severe kind.

The Prime Minister said the other day that the programme of legislation introduced by the Government was of a moderate character. No one would deny that the legislation he had succeeded in carrying was still more moderate. How did it arise that with a moderate programme the Government, with a large majority behind them, were forced to drop important measures and to fall back on forms of arbitrary and unusual procedure? Obviously, there must be something wrong. There was something at work in the House of Commons. It was not the Opposition because the Opposition always opposed contemplated legislation. But there was something now at work in the House of Commons which had made it less easy for the Government to carry their legislation and which had led to great congestion and inconvenience of business. The right hon. Gentleman's Leadership of the House had been much praised in the newspapers whose editors he had ennobled or promoted. That was a fact which could not be disputed. He could not help thinking that if the right hon. Gentleman trusted a little more to reason, and to taking the House into his confidence and frankly endeavouring to convince them of the justice of his measures, and if he were a little more able to assert that he possessed the confidence of the country, business would go through with greater despatch. When the right hon. Gentleman had a controversial measure which he wished to pass he did not introduce it at the beginning of the session. No; he brought it forward at such a period of the session as would enable him to say, "Obviously we have not time between now and the 12th of August to discuss the measure properly." And so the House had to discuss it improperly. How much time had they wasted—for it was wasted—in vain endeavours to find out from the Prime Minister whether he agreed with protection or not? When the right hon. Gentleman was asked a plain Question, which would save him days, he did not give a plain Answer. He mocked at the ignorance of other Members of the House less intellectually subtle than himself, and who were absolutely unable to fathom his real mind on this question.

Last of all, the causes and the reasons which had delayed the Government business and had disturbed the good humour of the House, had been the increasing resort of the Prime Minister to the practice of putting down blocking Motions. Whenever there was an awkward question to be discussed the right hon. Gentleman, instead of preparing a good case, wrote out a blocking Notice and handed it in at the Table by p roxy. Everybody knew what the form was. The result was that in a session not unusually encumbered with any great quality of legislation they had not been able to discuss a most all the important subjects which had been occupying the attention of the country. Supported by that valuable prop, the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters, with or without his careful supervision, had succeeded in preventing any adequate discussion of the vast changes contemplated in the Army, new points of development which had arisen in connection with South African labour; a very inadequate debate upon what he ventured to call the cruel and barbarous expedition to Tibet, and had not enabled the House to examine in any way the costly, profitless, and fruitless operations in Somaliland. By the use of blocking Motions this House was losing its function as the arena for the discussion of great questions interesting to the country.

There was one thing on which they might congratulate the Prime Minister. After all, they were nearly at the end of the session, and there was the Prime Minister still! The procedure of the House of Commons had been mutilated. Never mind! A great quantity of money had been expended. Never mind! No legislation of any value had been passed. Never mind! But there was the Prime Minister, at the end of the session, a great deal more than many people could have expected or hoped for. He offered to the right hon. Gentleman, most sincerely, his most humble congratulations on his achievement. These congratulations were absolutely sincere, because the right hon. Gentleman would make a great mistake if he supposed that any, on that side of the House, were in any hurry to witness the termination of the spectacle which had been presented that session. He apprehended there was no limit, short of the Septennial Act, to the right hon. Gentleman's capacity of holding out to retain office. But he ventured to think that the process was expensive. He estimated that the rent to be paid by the right hon. Gentleman would amount to 10,000 votes a month, or 120,000 votes a year, at the rate of 1,000 votes per Parliamentary day. That was the price which the right hon. Gentleman was paying out of the votes of his Party for the continuance of his Government in office under present conditions. And while they saw nothing in his conduct of public affairs which should conduce to make more easy the passage of his legislation, at the same time they had no reason to regret the continuance of a state of things which could only lead to a much more precise and emphatic decision by the country when the hour of decision arrived.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said that, as a representative of an Irish constituency, he wished to enter his protest as to the way in which Irish legislation had been treated this year. Four Irish Bills had been introduced by the Government. All of these Bills were of considerable importance. One of them was promised last session by the Government, and it was used as a means for facilitating the passage of the Irish Land Purchase Bill. He alluded to the Labourers Bill. Now, the Irish labourers were a very important class which could not be neglected with impunity. They were very numerous and very powerful, and hitherto they had been very contented under the most miserable conditions. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary promised that a Bill would be brought forward by the Government and passed this year to remedy the grievances of the labourers of which they had complained year after year. How had that promise been redeemed? It was quite true that after considerable delay a Bill had been introduced. It had been criticised by Irish Members from every quarter of the House, and it was admitted to be a most lame and impotent Bill. But no Member from Ireland would undertake the responsibility of preventing the Second Reading being taken in the hope, which was rather encouraged by the Chief Secretary, that it would be amended in its passage through the House, because in the shape in which it was introduced it was not likely to be productive of the least benefit to the labourers. It was a mere sop, in order to rebut the suggestion that the Government had broken their faith with Ireland in regard to this question. The first thing the Government did was to send the Bill to the Grand Committee on Trade. He could not say what occurred in that Committee, because he was not a member of it. But he had heard that, after two or three days, it was stated on behalf of the Government that because of some obstruction offered in the name of the Treasury, it would be impossible to meet the demands of the Irish Members, or to amend the Bill in such a way as to make it productive of the slightest advantage to the labourers. As in the case of the Aliens Bill, the Government were very glad to take advantage of that, and avail themselves of the excuse to drop the Bill.

But there were other three Bills relating to Ireland, all very important. One of these was the Loans Fund Amendment Bill. That was a most important measure, affecting the very humblest and poorest class of the community. Unquestionably, from the evidence of the various officers throughout Ireland, considerable loss had been sustained by the very poorest class in the community. An Act was passed by the present Government three or four years ago for the purpose of removing the evils caused by a previous faulty Act. Numbers of poor people in Ireland put their money into debentures in this Loan Fund and it turned out that there was no money to pay the interest on these debentures, and the whole of their savings had been lost. Then a Bill was introduced for the purpose of remedying this grievance. And what was the fate of that Bill? It was one of the measures which the Prime Minister assured the House was to be dropped—a Bill affecting the comfort and prosperity of the class on whom the peace and happiness of Ireland depended. Another Bill was the Irish Development Grant Bill. If that were to be proceeded with at three or four o'clock in the morning, possibly there would not have been a single Irish Member present. The Bill purported to sweep away two of the Judgeships in the Superior Court of Ireland, and to alter the whole judicial system which had existed in Ireland for centuries. He would not discuss the Bill, because he would not be in order; or say that he would oppose it when it came on, if he were in the House. But the Bill was to effect organic changes in the judicial system which had existed for centuries, and should not be introduced under circumstances which would not give the Irish representatives an opportunity of discussing or amending it if necessary. He thought, at any rate, that the legal profession had a right to complain; and a Bill of that sort should not be rushed through the House when the English Members were not awake, and all the Irish Members were absent. He regarded it as the greatest possible farce to enter into a discussion of such a very important measure at five or six o'clock in the morning in an exhausted House.

Then there was the Irish Land Bill. That Bill, which would pass without much discussion, was brought in to remedy the defects of that much discussed measure, the Irish Land Purchase Act. But there were a great many hon. Members who would desire to discuss the principle as to whether the bonus should be given to the tenant for life.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman will not be in order in discussing the Bill.

MR. HEMPHILL said he would only mention that the Bill would be more satisfactory to Irish public opinion if it were passed when the Irish Members were present. For his own part, he did not see the necessity of Parliament proroguing on or about 12th August. Members who were worshippers of "St. Grouse" might indulge in their tastes, leaving behind Members who were more intent on legislation. The House had often sat into September, not to speak of Autumn sessions; and it would be much better and more decent, if he might use the expression, in the eyes of the public if legislation were carried on deliberately up to the very eve of the prorogation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it would perhaps be the most convenient course if he were to reply at that point of the debate. The debate had been very much of the character of the debates which had taken place before on similar occasions. He had never known it admitted by the Opposition of the day that the Bills which the Government had passed were of any value or that any value was to be found except in the Bills which they did not pass. Bills seemed to become surrounded with quite a lustre and a halo from the fact of their not succeeding in the struggle for existence, and the actual legislation which had been passed had always been regarded either as useless or worse than useless. It had been said that private Members had not had enough time, and that Supply had not been discussed sufficiently, and there had been an occasional seasoning of the ordinary elaborately prepared personalities of the Member for Oldham. Among the critics of the Government had been the hon. Member for Aberdeen, who pointed to the experience of the session as conclusive proof of the failure of the new rules. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken in his criticism. In the debates on the new rules he never held out to the House the smallest prospect that the great prolongation of debate which had been the growing disease of the House for many years past would be effectually dealt with by those changes. It was not to these new rules or any modification of them that he had ever looked forward as affording a real issue from the embarrassment in which the House had undoubtedly long found itself. That change—if and when it came—must take a very different form, and all he could now point out to the House was this, that they had only to listen to the debate that had been going on that afternoon to see that if the double set of critics who always attacked the Government on these occasions were to be satisfied, the work of the session could not be got through in twelve months. Parliament would sit the whole year and would leave its work unfinished. Some critics said that time enough was not given for criticising the Government; others said that a great amount of legislation was left undone. Considering that all the time not given to legislation was given to criticism and that all the time not given to criticism was given to legislation, it was clear that in a given number of months everything that was taken away from criticism was given to legislation, and that everything that was taken away from legislation was given to criticism, and there was no way out of that. When the hon. Member for Oldham, or some hon. Member taking the same line, attacked the Government for not having passed the Bills, which, as the Government did not propose them, they regarded as extremely valuable, and other Members maintained that more time ought to have been given to Supply, whilst a third set said that the ten days or eleven days given to fiscal discussions were not enough, or that five or six days given to the yellow labour discussion were not enough, the smallest common sense, the most moderate modicum of the rationality which a person would apply to his own affairs, would show that the House of Commons could not possibly meet all these demands without throwing upon itself a burden which would undoubtedly break down the whole representative system of the country.

He would pass to the questions put to him regarding particular Bills. He would mention first the Musical Copyright Bill, because this was the only session that he recollected in which the plea had been put forward by Gentlemen interested in private Bills for one private Bill alone. He was obliged to reply, as he had done on many previous occasions, that a private Bill, if it were opposed, could not obtain facilities at the end of the session. No Government could give facilities, and Governments had always got into trouble by trying to do so. If, indeed, it were possible to conciliate the opposition to the Bill, which he did not think came from a very large number of Members, nobody would rejoice more than he. So far as he was able to judge, the Bill really did endeavour to find a remedy for a very hard state of things affecting a very deserving section of the community. He had been asked about the Constabulary Bill. That was a Bill which it was desirable to pass, but it was not a Bill on which he could ask the House to spend a great deal of time. If he understood the matter rightly, it was required largely for the interests of the Treasury and indirectly for Ireland. As to the Bill relating to County Courts, he was certainly surprised to hear that the new Bill repealed the old one.

*Sir ALBERT ROLLIT: In express words.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Do I understand that it does not re-enact substantially the same measure?

*Sir ALBERT ROLLIT: It does not re-enact the same measure. Instead of giving to all County Courts increased jurisdiction it gives it only to some to be selected by the Lord Chancellor, and it omits one important provision as to costs in the High Court, viz., Clause 116 of the County Courts Act.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said such a measure could hardly be described as a Bill repealing the old Bill. However, he need not go into those matters, as the Bill was not one which he thought it possible to ask the House to deal with at this late period of the session, since it would require considerable discussion. With regard to the Port of London Bill, it had been suggested that its only opponents were to be found among the Members for the City of London.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: Principal.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not know how the hon. gentleman defined "principal." If he meant numerically the greatest he should say the hon. Gentleman was entirely incorrect. From information which had reached him he believed that the opposition came from a very much larger section. The procedure which had been suggested, that the Government should prove that opposition existed by trying to pass the Bill, had always when attempted been described by the Opposition as an egregious waste of time. Whether it would be possible to carry over the Bill was another question, and if hon. Gentlemen would ask him about the matter at Question time in a day or two he would give a final answer on the subject. There had been some discussion about the Aliens Bill, chiefly by two hon. Gentlemen—one of them sitting on that Front Bench and the other the Member for Oldham—whose chief ambition had been to show that they had no hand in destroying the Bill; that it was entirely due to a pernicious Government that the Bill had been destroyed. He did not desire to deprive hon. Gentlemen of any satisfaction they might obtain from that line of argument.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked whether the Bill would be reintroduced next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had already stated the views of the Government on that point. He had been attacked for his management of Supply. In the first place, it had been said that on three occasions when Supply was under discussion he had procured the adjournment of the House before the dinner hour. But Members were aware that there were frequently occasions when more business was done by stopping at half-past seven than by continuing till midnight. A second criticism was that really important questions had not been discussed in Committee of Supply. He had endeavoured to pursue his steadily declared policy that the critics of the Government on both sides should, as far as possible, be consulted with regard to the allocation of the business of Supply. If the motive of those critics had been imperfectly expressed the Government could not be blamed for that.

There was one general criticism upon the work of the session with which he had the profoundest sympathy. Year after year a number of small Government Bills were introduced and failed to pass. There were many defects in their rules, but the one which it was of most importance, from the point of view of public interest, to remedy was to be found in the machinery for dealing with these smaller measures. The large Bill of the session the Government would always insist on passing. It might have to be got through by methods which they all admitted to be clumsy and the necessity for which they all regretted, but it would be got through. There was no corresponding machinery for getting through small Bills, nor did he see any easy modification of their rules—any modification which would not be almost revolutionary in its character which would enable these Bills to pass. They could not do that kind of work by any form of Home Rule or provincial councils, because these Bills had an operation throughout the whole of the United Kingdom, and must therefore be dealt with by an Assembly which had authority over the whole of the United Kingdom. He did not believe delegation to Grand Committee was sufficient to meet the difficulty, and his consideration of the question had not satisfied him that this great blot upon our Parliamentary institutions was one easy of remedy. He could only hope that those who had criticised the Government would devote some of their attention to thinking how this matter could be dealt with, and perhaps in some future time a means would be devised by which to remove this defect which all must regret.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said the statement made by the Prime Minister was most alarming. The net result of the session's work so far as Ireland was concerned was that the Vote for Irish Education had been docked by £100. And, after that, the Prime Minister promised that he would kill the one Bill they wanted and pass another Bill for which nobody asked. English Members complained of the Government and of Parliament, but, after all, it was their own Parliament and their own Government—a poor thing, but their own. But in the case of the Irish people it was not their Parliament nor their Government. Could English Members conceive any Irish Assembly, however contemptible or illustrious, however democratic or aristocratic, whether it brought forward proposals of the most squalid or the most majestic dimensions, which, after six months of harassing labour, would have to confess that the net result of the whole thing was not *nil* but a minus quantity, namely, the loss of £100? The Prime Minister had now admitted that there was no cure for this disease, and that next year and the year after the position would be as bad. The Prime Minister had divided British possessions into two categories—those obtained by peaceful occupation, and those which had been obtained by warlike conquest. He (the speaker) did not know into which category Ireland was placed. But, as regarded the future, the Prime Minister told them he saw no cure for the evil, and he asked those of them who were not in the Government, and who never would be in it, and who had no voice in this House except on sufferance, to devise a remedy. After all, if the Irish people had the smallest shanty of a Parliament of their own, he supposed that they would be able to legislate upon herrings, canals, commerce of some kind, and free trade and protection. There might be a "blocker," but they would probably be able to invent some means of getting round him. But to tell him that the net result of six months arduous labour on the part of a large body of Irish representatives would be the loss of £100 was a most miserable suggestion of what Parliament should be.

The Prime Minister suggested that he would drop the Irish Charitable Loans Bill. He admitted there was some opposition to it. But what was the Irish Loans Fund? It was a body managed by Dublin Castle, whose inspectors were appointed by Dublin Castle, and Dublin Castle invited honest people to invest their money in debentures to be lent out at reasonable interest on the faith of the security of British audit and management. The result was that something like £200,000 or £300,000 had gone, and the British Government calmly announced that they would not even pass legislation to enable it to be collected. This money was largely the money of pensioners, ex-soldiers, politicians, clergymen. He believed there were a few clergymen on both sides, and year after year this Government-managed business had failed to meet not only its interest but its principal. The total deficit did not amount to more than about £250,000, and yet the Government not only declined to meet that but refused the machinery of collection. The Prime Minister absolutely shone on occasions like this, and it required a very subtle mind to appreciate his distinctions. The right hon. Gentleman knew what reality or unreality there was behind an attack such as had been made upon him, because he himself had attacked Governments a thousand times and had heard replies by the greatest masters of Parliamentary strategy. The hon. Member for Antrim had asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he intended to go on with the Judicature and Development Grant Bill, but the Prime Minister said nothing about that Bill; he only referred to the Development Grant Bill. He would only suppose that the abolition of the Judges was going to be dropped and the development portion of the Bill was to be proceeded with. When the Prime Minister was asked a Question by one of his own supporters he remained as steadfastly silent on the subject as if he were asked a Question about free trade. While nobody was more anxious than himself to see established a kind of Irish Exchequer, for that was what the Government were being driven into, he must say that the Irish Members should remember that all this was in aid of the British Treasury and the Irish landlords. While the Government refused to the Loan Fund debenture-holders the payment of monies practically guaranteed by the Government, they did suggest that at one scoop they should capture £150,000 of the finest fund in Ireland and apply it practically to the issue of stock to enable the landlords to be paid in sovereigns instead of paper. The Chief Secretary shook his head, and therefore he would not pursue the matter further; but that was the interpretation he put upon the Bill. Whatever time was devoted to these two Irish Bills he thought they should be given a little notice of the intention to bring them forward, and that they should be brought forward at some reasonable period, if at all.

With regard to the Land Bill, he intended to support the Government throughout upon it, although he wished to propose Amendments in regard to the incidence of the bonus, as he believed its incidence had not been apprehended by the House or the country. But he considered that he was in honour bound to support the Government which came forward at the time when Irish Members were unanimous in demanding that the bonus should be given in a particular way and agreed that £100,000,000 should be voted on the faith of an agreement between landlords and hon. Members for Ireland. In the face of that bargain, made openly in the House of Commons, it was no secret arrangement made behind the Chair or in the Lobby, but a solemn bargain made between the Government and the Irish Party, it would redound to the everlasting discredit of Irishmen, whoever they might be, who went back on that solemn pact. But he thought they were entitled to discuss the incidents arising out of the transactions which were not apprehended at the time the Bill was passed. If he was told that time would not allow of the discussion of those matters he conceived he was so bound by the main principle of the Bill that he would not press his opposition to what he called mere details to the extent of needlessly occupying time. But that would only be on the condition that measures, which he apprehended nobody wanted—such as the proposal to alienate £150,000 of the Fines Funds and to grab money that was intended by the Local Government Act of 1898 to go in relief of taxation, for the relief of the Treasury or for landlord purposes, were not pressed. If the Government insisted on going on with Bills which were really contentious and asked him to give up the time that should really be occupied by the other Bills—that was not a proposition to which he could assent. He thought that, on the whole, this session in the way in which it had been consumed—he would not say wasted—would be a memorable one for Ireland. For himself, he did not think the Labourers Bill was such a great loss. What he thought would strike the people of Ireland, was the inefficiency of this Parliament to bring to the most troubled and most anxious portion of the Empire—the sick child of the family—relief, comfort, legislation, or even debate, and the confession of the Prime Minister of England himself that there was no remedy for the evil.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) moved as an Amendment that Fridays be excluded from the operation of the Resolution.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to move that the Question be now put. [Opposition cries of "Oh."]

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I object. I respectfully object, Mr. Speaker, because I want to speak. I have something to say.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know whether the hon. Member has something to say or not, but I have not accepted the Motion. I called on the hon. Member for Anglesey to move his Amendment which I think is one that may be disposed of very shortly.

Mr. DELANY: I hope you will not shut me out afterwards, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH said his Amendment would give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of relaxing the rigour of his proposal. The Prime Minister was the champion of the week-end holiday, and if he was going to sit up the greater part of every night in the week, he would need a little recreation on Friday or Saturday. The health of the Prime Minister was one of the assets of Parliament which should be carefully guarded. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that only one Bill in a session should be treated in a drastic manner. Inasmuch, therefore, as one Bill had already been drastically treated this session, he submitted that Friday should be exempted from this Motion, as the measure down for Friday next, though not a long Bill, was exceedingly contentious——

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will not be in order in discussing particular Bills; he must confine his remarks solely to the question of the omission of Friday.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH said another point was that on Friday there would be no interval beyond the half-hour at two o'clock. He appealed for some modification of the Motion in the interests both of the Prime Minister and of the House generally.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'except,' to insert the words 'on Fridays and'."—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the only reason the hon. Member had been able to put forward in support of his Amendment was the consideration of his (the speaker's) health, and he was grateful for the hon. Member's consideration. They would doubtless not rise at half-past five, the usual hour on Fridays, but he could see no reason why the sittings should be unduly prolonged beyond that hour. While unable to accept the Amendment he thanked the hon. Member for the spirit in which he had moved it.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, N.) thought there ought to be some understanding with regard to Fridays, upon which day it should be remembered the House met at noon. There was an understanding the last time a rule of this kind was passed that the House should not sit beyond 6.30 or 7 o'clock on Fridays. He hoped the Prime Minister would assent to the suggestion, that as they met at 12 o'clock on Fridays the sitting on that day should not be unduly prolonged.

Mr. DELANY said he wished to support the Amendment which had been proposed in order to relieve them on one night of the week from attending long discussions. He quite sympathised with the Prime Minister in the position in which he had been placed. His hon. and learned friend the Member for Louth had spoken of the great disappointment he had experienced in regard to Irish legislation that session, and he quite shared that disappointment. He had sat in the House of Commons through the whole of the session and he had been extremely disappointed at the attitude of the Government in regard to Irish legislation. They were primarily interested in two Bills.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, Order! The hon. Member must confine his remarks to the Amendment.

Mr. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) said he desired to join in the appeal which had been made with regard to Friday sittings. In the public interest he hoped the Prime Minister would make some statement with regard to the business of the House on Fridays. It was physically impossible to transact public business efficiently or discuss measures late on Friday after the long sittings which would take place on the days preceding Friday. The Bills which would be brought in during Friday sittings could not be discussed, and ought not to be discussed under those circumstances, and therefore he joined with those who had appealed to the Prime Minister not to extend the length of the sittings on Friday to any great extent.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he was not at all sure that this Amendment was necessary because the Resolution before the House referred only to the interruption of business at 12 o'clock, 7.30, and 5.30 on Fridays.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) thought the hon. Member for King's Lynn was mistaken, because he remembered that they sat after 6 o'clock last session under the same Order. He wished to appeal to the Leader of the House to use the powers he would probably get very moderately, not only on Fridays but upon other nights. They all recognised that there was sure to be a long discussion at this period of the session upon the suspension of the Twelve O'clock Rule, but he hoped the Prime Minister would not prolong the sittings to a late hour in the morning. If the House sat after seven o'clock on Fridays it destroyed all the chances of a holiday for the week-end.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said if the Prime Minister would meet them by getting up and stating that he did not intend to prolong the sittings on Fridays he thought his hon. friend would withdraw his Amendment, but the right hon. Gentleman, by refusing to do this, rather implied that he intended to continue the sittings late on Fridays. This was most distasteful to hon. Members on both sides, and he thought the Prime Minister would find it most disagreeable to himself. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would say a word or two and come to some sort of an agreement.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 208. (Division List No. 291.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.

Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptE C(S Andrw'sBghs
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone,Rt HnHerbert John
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Lewis V.(Rossendale)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Leamy, Edmund
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberston, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas,JA(Glamorgan,Gower)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert
Walton,John Lawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid,)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Warner.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour,Rt.Hn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles,T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt HnJ.A.(Glasgow)
Campbell,J H M(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb,Rt.Hon. Sir John C.R.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antirm,S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon. Sir JosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fergusson,Rt Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy,Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest

Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip.S.(Warwick,S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath,James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A.(Stafford, W.)
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hn. James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell,RtHn.SirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W J H(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he felt bound to say how seriously he personally, and he thought many other hon. Members also, regarded the abandonment of the Scotch Education Bill. He confessed that he was a little surprised that the hon. Members opposite, who represented Scotch constituencies, should allow the Bill to go derelict with so little protest to the Prime Minister. Of course, he quite realised that at this stage of the session there was not time to carry the Bill now. He felt that it reflected no very great credit on the legislative capacity of this House for the discharge of its business when, at such a stage, the Government had to abandon a Bill which was practically non-contentious and against which no division had been taken; which had been discussed in the fairest way on both sides of the House, and which had been carried after considerable exertion to such a point that two or three more days of Parliamentary time would easily have been sufficient to allow of its being passed. The postponement of this Bill was a very grave and serious matter for Scottish education. He did not think it would be held by hon. Members of this House that the people of Scotland were less willing to undertake the labours of education than other people were. But it was an undoubted fact that at this moment Scotland stood in a position of distinct inferiority as regarded the organisation of higher education than any other part of Great Britain, or even than every civilised Country in the world. That, in itself, was a state of matters which called for much more serious treatment than it had received in the House. It ought to have been a matter of the greatest urgency on the part of the Government to carry into law the Bill which they had introduced and which had been so favourably and generously received in every part of the House and in every part of Scotland. The postponement of the Bill was very serious from a practical point of view, because the money which had been granted to Scotland in lieu of that which had been spent under the English Education Act was at present being devoted to the relief of rates; and he was sure that every year that that was continued would make it more difficult to devote that money to higher education instead of to the relief of the rates. But more than that. Anyone at all familiar with educational work in Scotland knew perfectly well that the very introduction of the Bill in the House had given a confident hope that it would be carried this year, and that, in the meantime, there had been a great deal of arrest of higher education in Scotland. The certainty that a new scheme was about to be introduced made it impossible for those who had been doing good work in various districts—in the county councils and in the school boards—to proceed in the development of that kind of education until they knew what legislation in regard to it would be introduced. Still more serious was the fact that, if the Bill was withdrawn, they might not see it again, or, at any rate, any Bill half so good. The Prime Minister took a hopeful view of next session, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would give a definite pledge that the Scotch Education Bill would take an important place in the next King's Speech. He made not the least complaint of the way in which the Scotch Education Bill had been brought before the House by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, but because the Bill had been lost by the failure of the Government to make any serious attempt to carry it. It might have been carried if only two or three more days had been devoted to it. Various essays had been made to bring in other Bills which had been dropped. Time had been spent on these Bills which might have been given more usefully to the Scotch Education Bill, and if so, it could have been easily carried. But they had also to consider the selection of the Bills which the Prime Minister had made. He would venture to suggest to the Prime Minister that he should turn his mind to, or suggest to his followers in Scotland, some explanation of the choice he had made in dropping this Scotch Education Bill.

The Scottish Unionists were a very estimable and ingenuous body of men, but they would be unable to explain to the people of Scotland why their Education Bill had been placed behind the Licensing Bill and the Welsh Defaulting Authorities Bill. These Bills had certain properties in common; both conferred pecuniary advantages on certain sections of the right hon. Gentleman's supporters, although it would be seen that they were thoroughly disliked by the people by whom they were to be applied. The Scottish Unionists and their representatives who supported the Government must ask themselves what the reasons really were for the Government giving priority to the measures to which he had referred over the Education Bill which had been so long promised to Scotland. He did not raise this question for the purpose of recrimination, although recrimination was abundantly called for by the way in which this Bill and the Scotch Members had been treated by the Government; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would say whether he was prepared to reintroduce the Bill in the course of the next session.

Mr. DELANY rose to continue the debate.

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Question is that the Question be now put.

Mr. DELANY: I object, Sir. It is a marked insult to the Irish Members that not one of them should be heard on this Question. I protest against it. [MINISTERIAL ironical laughter.] Hon. Members opposite will be on this side by and by, and they will see what will happen then.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided: Ayes, 212; Noes, 134. (Division List, No. 292.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow)
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby, Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurs
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyue
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. Goerge Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Birghtside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt HnCol. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt Hn.SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. Geogre
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H

Tellers for the Ayes. Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowees

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asherl Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E C(S Andr'wsBghs
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Grey,Rt.Hon.Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,,Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir ArthurD.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon, Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson,Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Leamy, Edmund
Leese,Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert
Walton,John Lawson(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Tellers for the Noes.—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 216; Noes, 128. (Division List, No. 293.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus HenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn. HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manc'r)
Balfour,Rt.HnGeraldW. Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry

Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn. J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn.JA(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Colomb, Rt.Hn. Sir John C.R.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick,SW
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin &Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, WalfordD(Wednesbury
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald

Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'derry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F.Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords.N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir JohnH
Kerr, John.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lee,Arthur H(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Morgan,David J(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Murray, RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.

Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley,Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S.G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, RtHn. SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt.Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES,—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William(Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling

Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott

Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams

Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. J. H. Whitley and Mr. Trevelyan.

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted, except at half-past Seven of the clock at an Afternoon Sitting, under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

Class II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,960, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Expenses in respect of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in the Department of His Majesty's Treasury."

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) said he did not propose at that stage of the discussion to make any broad statement of policy. He thought the House was thoroughly acquainted with the grounds which induced the Government to remodel the Committee of Defence. It was necessary for its new condition that there should be a staff which should assist the members of the Committee adequately to perform their work, and should also give them that element of continuity which he thought was so valuable a portion of the new machinery which had been created. He proposed to reserve himself to answer the Questions which would doubtless be put to him from both sides of the House. He would only mention now the fact that one of the great incidental advantages which every Member of the House, he thought, would agree with him in regarding as a consequence of this Amendment was that the House could for the first time discuss certain military and naval problems in their entirety. Under the old system and the old rules the discussion on the Navy Estimates was strictly confined to the Navy, and the discussion on the Army Estimates to the Army. There were, therefore, excluded from the consideration of the House certain questions which it would, he dared say, be hard to discuss in detail with any advantage, but which should not be absolutely excluded from general consideration.

SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall) observed that, whatever its merits might be, the proposal was not the proposal of the Esher Committee, which was that there should be not only a principal secretary, but two naval, two military, and two Indian assistant secretaries. Those secretaries had been reduced to two.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to say that there would probably be an Indian representative.

SIR A. HAYTER agreed with the Prime Minister as to the great advantage of the proceedings of the Defence Committee being brought before the House of Commons, as since its initiation in 1895 it had been a somewhat nebulous body which Members of the House had never heard of or seen. He thought the proposal as regards staff was a very moderate one; he had assisted at certain War Office Committees, but he had never heard of any Committee of any size which had not a secretary to record its proceedings. It was very necessary, with a body that would have to deal with matters of the first importance, that they should have some person responsible for keeping the records and preparing the documents necessary for the proper working of the members of the Committee. He anticipated great advantages from the deliberations of a body which would be able to consider naval and military affairs together, and to come to definite conclusions from which he believed considerable economies ought to result.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said that all students of this question would heartily welcome the formation on some definite basis of the Committee of Imperial Defence. When they considered the gravity and the ramifications of the questions that would come before the Committee, they must agree that the Estimate now put forward was a very moderate one. If, however, this Vote was to be simply a sub-head of the Treasury Vote, to be discussed at the end of the session, he thought it would not be in its proper place. He was glad the wishes of the House had been so far met, but he would point out that when he originally brought to the notice of the House in 1888 the waste and confusion which resulted from the entirely separate discussion of naval and military policies, his proposal was that before the estimates were discussed there should be a statement made by a Minister of the Crown defining the general principles of Imperial Defence by which the policy of the Government was guided. He suggested, therefore, that this Vote in future should be brought forward prior to the introduction of the Army and Navy Estimates, so that it might render more effective the discussions on Vote A and Vote 1 of those Estimates. He regarded the establishment of this Committee as the greatest step that had been taken for many years in the direction of putting our defensive system on a proper basis. Hitherto there had been no machinery by which various parts of the Empire might be brought, so to speak, into focus, and he welcomed this Committee as a means of enabling Ministers to see in true perspective the real necessities of the Empire. The experience of the last forty years showed that we had been drifting about without any real policy at all, and he regarded that as mainly due to the fact that Prime Ministers had no means of co-ordinating the various views brought before him, with the result that the strongest Minister of the day was able unduly to influence general policy in a particular direction by the views of his Department.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

Class II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,960, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Expenses in respect of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in the Department of His Majesty's Treasury."

* **Sir JOHN COLOMB**, continuing his speech, said he had already drawn attention to the beneficial effect of this Committee to record and collect information so that the Prime Ministers of future times could have the broad concrete facts brought before them. There was another advantage which would be to the advantage of the House itself, namely, that the main principles would now have an opportunity of being heard and discussed in this House, and in that way and from that fact it would percolate down. Thus there was a hope that, in the future, public opinion would be formed on a true basis and broad issues, and from that we might hope for continuity of policy based on facts. He emphasised the great importance of the step taken by the Government. There had been no greater intellect in this House than that of the late Mr. Gladstone, yet what happened to him for want of such a Committee as this? When this country was alarmed in 1870 that we might be invaded what did Mr. Gladstone say? He tried to allay the feeling of alarm in the country by proclaiming that while the ironclad fleets of other nations could circle round our shores at fifteen miles an hour the Volunteers could get from point to point at twenty or thirty miles an hour. That showed that he had not had the salient points of the British position brought before him as a whole. Had this Committee been in existence Mr. Gladstone could not have put forward such a false view of our situation as that. Then with regard to the garrisoning of our coaling stations, our coal was distributed all over the world without any protection at all. He (Sir John) for years had pleaded for moderate defence for it, and then came the Carnarvon Commission to inquire into the matter. If this Committee of Defence had been in existence they would have had reasonable protection given to our coaling stations and there would not have been this exaggeration of fortifications necessitating gigantic garrisons as a protective force. One of the questions to be considered by the Committee was the excessive garrisoning of our coaling stations. He had said so much about this matter in the past that it was not necessary now to go into details, but if he knew anything at all he knew something of the manifold difficulties which had to be faced by the Defence Committee owing to the total absence of principle on our part, through which we had got into a position of wastefulness that it would take us a long time to escape from.

He believed that the new advisory machinery now set up would enable us to get clear of our military confusion, but it would take a long time before its full fruits were reaped, though every day we should be gaining something. He looked upon the discussion in Parliament on this Vote as bringing the country and the Government to a position of being able to form a sound judgment on sound principles. He remembered being quite startled in one of the Committee-rooms upstairs, when Lord Randolph Churchill was presiding over the inquiry into our naval and military expenditure. He remembered a representative of the War Office calmly stating that if our Fleet was damaged or inefficient for the space of three weeks there would be no difficulty in the way of France throwing 150,000 men upon our shores, and when he saw Lord Randolph Churchill swallow such a statement as that without question he wondered how long this sort of thing was going to continue. He should have thought that the question, if the Defence Committee had been in existence, would have been how were they to get over? He mentioned this fact because he thought that anyone who claimed to be a statesman could not and ought not to accept a statement like that without seeing whether it was a feasible statement or not. It was a question of ports, harbours, and means of transport, a maritime and not a military problem. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean would remember perfectly well the most unseemly wrangle which occurred in this House between the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War on the question of transport and of the possibility of France being able to do what the War Office asserted, and it was perfectly obvious that had Ministers had an opportunity of studying both sides of the question by means of such a Committee as this such a wrangle would never have occurred, because they would have weighed both the naval and military aspects in the balance and a true solution would have been found.

He felt most strongly that the question of the defence of this Empire was not so much a question for experts as for statesmen. Every hour that he had lived he had been more impressed with the fact that one must not follow blindly the opinion of experts in high policy. It was a question for statesmanship, and the effect of this Committee was that it was a step forward and that all future statesmen would be able to examine both sides of the question. They knew the resources they had at their command and that they would have to study not only efficiency in defence but economy as well, and as time went on we should have more and more a rational and continuous system based on some sort of principle. Ministries would pass away, and Members of this House would pass away before the enormous advantages of the step taken by the formation of this Committee of Defence would be realised by the country. What was stated by the Norfolk Commission with regard to the possibility of France being able to collect troops at the ports of that country in a short period was no doubt true, but how were they to come over? How were they going to collect their transport? The collection of transport necessary to enable them to land upon these shores in military form would be a matter not of hours, nor of days, but of months. The advantage he saw in the step which had been taken was great, and he felt that the Government deserved infinite credit for having initiated something upon which could be built up a continuous system upon settled principles. They had to look at the Empire as a whole, and they had to apply to it reasonable principles. The defence of the Empire was the biggest problem man ever had to solve, and it could only be solved by the application of proper principles. Successful war depended on two things; to be at the right place at the right time, and the vital question to settle was the question of distribution. Organisation is subservient to distribution. Reasonable probability pointed to where our forces, and the nature and amount of our forces were required then, and not till then, should we approach the question of organisation. He saw already in the scheme presented to the House the beginning of the education of that House in studying the operations of the Defence Committee. For the first time in our Army scheme a principle had been laid down, and hereafter he had great hopes that the application of the principle would be extended. His right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War had a better chance in this matter than any Minister ever had before for the reason given by Lord Wolseley who went up and down the country saying, "Before the military authorities are called upon to provide an Army they ought to be informed clearly and distinctly what kind of Army the country want. If that were done there would be no difficulty in providing the force required." Nobody then was prepared to tell Lord Wolseley what kind of Army was wanted. The Committee of Defence could now tell the military authorities what kind of an Army was wanted. He most warmly approved of the step that had been taken by the Prime Minister in this matter.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said he welcomed the reconstruction of the Defence Committee. The hon. Baronet who had just spoken had not in the least exaggerated the value it would be to the country in the future. They should now congratulate themselves on the fact that the defence of this country was a matter for which the Prime Minister of the country was directly responsible. The right hon. Gentleman would have behind him a body supplying him with all the information he required in order that he might treat the question in a statesmanlike manner. In past days Prime Ministers had to fish up information from all sorts of holes and corners and had nobody to give them the assistance they required. It was, in his opinion, a very great advantage that this Committee should have been started in a humble manner in order that as things grew it might be added to. He did not suppose as time went on that two sections would be the limit. This Committee would have to carry out duties analagous to those carried out by the principal committee of the Prussian army. It was well known that it took the German staff, not a certain number of months or years, but decades to get that general staff to the high state of efficiency at which it at present stood. We had a more difficult task to perform, and he presumed that little by little this staff would be increased. No doubt in the future there would be one representative for India and someone, if not actually deputed by the Colonies, who would have colonial experience, who would be in touch with our great Colonies, and who would be able to point out, in case of emergency, what those Colonies would be able to do and what amount of support they would be able to rely on from the mother country.

The Prime Minister had stated in May or June of this year that one of the difficult duties falling on such a body as this would be questions of this nature, questions which could not be dealt with in this House as they related in a certain measure to Army and Navy. In reference to the Navy alone it would be a question for them to decide what cruisers formed a proper complement to a fighting fleet and what number of cruisers would be required to patrol the seas for the protection of our commerce. The question of coaling stations was more important still, and on this particular question there was a lamentable spectacle of the naval and military authorities almost fighting over this matter. The Navy objected to take over the coaling stations because it clearly saw that it would entail an increased naval force, a larger Marine force, and that would entail a larger Vote, and they foresaw that in the future, in consequence, they might have to go short in the matter of guns or the building fund. On the other hand the military authorities objected to have their units broken up in order to defend the coaling stations, as it impaired the quality of the units as a fighting force. He himself had always been in favour of garrisoning the coaling stations with Marine forces. The Marine was far more suited to this work than the ordinary soldier. Now that we had this Committee of Defence it would be possible for the Prime Minister to lay down precisely what proportion of the defence was to be undertaken by the Navy and what by the Army.

There were those who held the view that at any moment we might be called upon to fight in the Indian Empire, and those who had specially studied this question knew that the great Power which we dreaded in India could only make an attack on the Indian Empire after several stages. It was not a contingency we were now called on to face, but one which we might be called on to face, but there were other contingencies which we had been called on to face more than once. On several occasions we had sent from India bodies of troops, and had lowered the garrisons of that Empire, but the time might come when it would not be wise to draw any body of troops from India without replacing them from here. The Defence Committee would place themselves in the position of the German staff, and they would have plans of campaign drawn up to meet those various contingencies, and we should not then see what we had seen for centuries, an attempt to provide for the Army and the Navy without knowing what the value of one or the other was. That was why they had two Army Corps schemes, very different in their nature. First the House was told that three Army Corps would be required in order that they might be landed on other shores if necessary, and now they were told that only 15,000 or 16,000 men were wanted for home defence. The present Secretary of State for War did not say so.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Yes, I do.

CAPTAIN NORTON said the right hon. Gentleman would perhaps point out next Monday what force he had in addition to the 16,000 men prepared at any moment to go abroad. He did not think he could do that without going for complete mobilisation. In the last two years there had been two different schemes put before the country. He was not blaming the present Secretary for War or his predecessor. They were doing their best to act up to the demand of the country. His opinion was that the Defence Committee would enable them to avoid all these difficulties. That body would lay down exactly what was needed in the way of naval and military defence, whether for home, India, or the Colonies. For these reasons he heartily supported the construction of the Committee.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said the Secretary of State for War, in his speech the other day, and also in the Memorandum which had been circulated, said that the recommendations of the Committee of three had been adopted *verbatim et literatim*. They all rejoiced to hear that. However they might differ on points of detail, broadly speaking the recommendations were of enormous value to the Army, the defences of the country, and the Empire generally. But the Estimates before the House did not embody the recommendations of the Committee with regard to what was called the "permanent nucleus." He should like to quote exactly what the Committee suggested. They said—

"Before proceeding to discuss the reconstruction of the War Office we are impelled to urge the immediate provision of what is in actual fact the corner stone of the needed edifice of reform."

"The permanent nucleus of the Defence Committee should consist of:—

"I. A Permanent Secretary, who should be appointed for five years, renewable at pleasure."

"II. Under this official, two naval officers, selected by the Admiralty, two military officers chosen by the War Office, and two Indian officers, nominated by the Viceroy, with, if possible, one or more representatives of the Colonies. These officers should not be of high rank, and the question of their appointment should be limited to two years. The duties of the permanent nucleus of the Defence Committee would be:—

"A. To consider all questions of Imperial Defence from the point of view of the Navy, the Military Forces, India, and the Colonies.

"B. To obtain and collate information from the Admiralty, War Office, India Office, Colonial Office, and other Departments of State.

"C. To prepare any documents required by the Prime Minister and the Defence Committee, anticipating their needs as far as possible.

"D. To furnish such advice as the Committee may ask for in regard to defence questions involving more than one Department of State.

"E. To keep adequate records for the use of the Cabinet of the day and its successors."

Those duties were of enormous extent, and it seemed to him that the staff proposed, perhaps it might be as a commencement, was insufficient to perform the duties placed upon them. The Prime Minister was good enough to say that hon. Members might ask Questions. That was a matter on which the right hon. Gentleman might reply. As far as he himself was concerned, he should be rather glad if the recommendations of the Committee of three were not very closely followed in this direction, because it seemed to him that, if the permanent nucleus which was referred to as the corner stone was made too strong, there was very considerable risk of the work they were doing, or would do, overlapping with the work which should be performed by the general staff of the Army. In this discussion to-night the fact that a general staff had been or was about to be set up at the War Office had been somewhat left out of sight. He had never been able to understand how it came about that the Committee of three referred to this permanent nucleus as a general staff. They said it was to—

"Fulfil the main functions of a general staff as they are now understood all over the civilised world by statesmen who have considered the necessities and conditione of Empire."

It did not seem to him that they had anything whatever in common with a general staff such as was known in connection with foreign armies. He supposed that the German staff was a kind of model, but there was no separate Committee of this kind connected with the

German organisation. He saw great necessity for having a Defence Committee, but he rather feared if it was made too strong it would be apt to set up a division of responsibility. Division of responsibility was one of the principal reasons for the breakdown of our system at the start of the war in 1899. At that time, as was well known, the Commander-in-Chief was entrusted with the duty of preparing strategical schemes, but the Secretary of State had the advantage or the disadvantage of four other advisers. That was the principal cause, he thought, of some of our great failures. There were too many advisers, and it was always possible to say So-and-so advised this and So-and-so advised that, and consequently when anything went wrong the soldiers were blamed, or the War Office was blamed, for what was really the result of our false system. He thought every safeguard should be taken now when they were laying the foundation of a valuable structure. There should not be any overlapping of that kind in future, no division of responsibility, no conflicting advice, which always must lead to disaster. In this case, according to the recommendations of the Committee of three, the Prime Minister had really what was a general staff of his own. The Secretary of State had also a staff, and it seemed quite possible that there might arise a serious conflict of opinion between those two bodies, and in the end when they tried to fix responsibility no one would know who was responsible. The general staff had many functions, but the principal function was to provide the Government, when asked for it, with a thoroughly thought-out and complete strategical plan for any military situation which might arise. That was done two years before the war broke out between Germany and Denmark. Von Roon wrote to his friend Moltke asking whether he had thought of the possibility of a collision with Denmark. He replied in the affirmative, stating that so many men and guns would be required, and enclosing a sketch for the first act. That was really general staff work. In Japan at the present time they had an illustration of how splendidly the general staff had come to the assistance of the nation in time of war. Where would the Japanese Government have been if they had had two or three different bodies advising them, and two or three different systems of obtaining advice? He felt sure that they would have fallen to the ground. He had put these points forward in the hope that some discussion would follow. While strongly supporting the Government in all they were doing now, and feeling that a great step was being taken in advance, he hoped that the danger of conflict between the general staff attached to the Prime Minister and the general staff of the War Office might be avoided, and that as much responsibility as possible should be thrown on one or other of these bodies.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the hon. and gallant Gentleman had complained that the staff of the new secretariat was insufficient. He could not but think that it would be possible for the secretariat to call in any staff that might be necessary. What the Committee had to deal with was the permanent staff of the Department, and he considered that ample for the permanent work. They could turn to the Intelligence Department of the Admiralty, or the Intelligence Department of the War Office, to work out any plan or details they required to have before them. The present proposal was the fourth form which the Cabinet Committee of Defence had taken. The first was that initiated by Lord Rosebery in the latter days of the Government over which he presided. Then came the announcement made by the new Government of 1895–1896 as to the new and extended form they had given to the Cabinet Committee. That second Committee was a failure. That it was a failure could be proved by the public statements that had been made. There was, for instance, the Colonial Conference, the documents laid before which body constituted a public scandal, and which threw back possibly for ever that *Kriegsverein* of which the House heard something the previous night. In addition to this, there was the evidence laid before the Duke of Norfolk's Commission in January of this year. The third form, which the Cabinet Committee adopted late in 1903, was announced by the Prime Minister, and now the

House had the fourth form. In the interests of economy as well as of efficiency he strongly advocated the collation of the views of the two services. It was the only way to reduce expenditure and also of getting the best value for the money spent on the two services. Within the last few years there had admittedly been a great waste in our national expenditure. It was understood that the invasion theory of this country had been abandoned. The Secretary of State for India said a few days ago that one of the chief critics of expenditure during the earlier years of the Government was now responsible for the War Office. He further stated that many critics had urged a reduction of Army expenditure, but that no one had supplied a scheme by which that reduction could be effected.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said that what he pointed out was that the Prime Minister, by placing his right hon. friend at the War Office, had given the best security for the reduction of expenditure. On that occasion he went on to say, pointing to the Opposition side of the House, that the critics of the Government had not yet shown that they had any plan in their minds, and that his right hon. friend had stated that reduction of expenditure could be accomplished mainly by the reduction of the number of men.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he heartily desired to see carried out the policy which the Government had announced in regard to a reduction of the Regular Army, which had been largely kept up on the basis of the invasion doctrine now repudiated. There was another invasion bogey which had to some extent taken the place of that they had succeeded in killing. It was the supposed need for Army Corps to reinforce the defence of the Indian frontier. The Government had continued to be impressed by the difficulty which the defence of India against invasion presented, and they had not solved that difficulty. They were defending their expeditionary force across the sea by the necessity of having large reinforcements for the Indian frontier, and Lord Curzon the other day said that if we had the misfortune to go to war with Russia we should have to attack Russia on the Indian frontier. That was as complete a bogey as the invasion theory of our own shores. Russia was not in a position rapidly to strike against India, because the transport difficulties were such that it would be years before it would become necessary to repel an invasion of India. The Government, however, were not clear in their views on that subject. He trusted that the Prime Minister and the civilian members of the Committee would exercise their own intelligence on this problem, and would not allow themselves to be guided entirely by expert opinion. It was notorious that the whole of the expert advisers of the Government had at one time believed that we could fight Russia in the Caucasus. A dream more wild to those who knew the facts and the country never entered into the mind of man. Therefore he hoped that the Prime Minister would subject this doctrine to as rigid a scrutiny as he had subjected the doctrines of invasion connected with this country.

There were other important questions which could not be settled by the Admiralty and the War Office, but by the Cabinet and the Prime Minister. There was our position in the Mediterranean. It was all right at present, but obviously the time was coming when the development of the submarine would affect the whole course of operations in that part of the world. They could not trust that question to the Admiralty alone, because it involved great political considerations connected with Malta, Egypt, the subject of alliances, and other political considerations. There was also the question as to the best places for our naval bases. These rested largely on policy, and partly on the development of invention and future changes in the Channel in time of war. It was extremely probable that we should be driven more and more to use bases in the Irish Channel or on the east coast of Scotland; and the question must be considered by the Prime Minister in conjunction with the Treasury. He was quite sure, if he could make his hon. friend understand the views which he held, that the hon. Gentleman would be at one with him in saying that that was the only sound way of reducing expenditure. Of course, there were similar questions which would obviously come continually before a body of this kind. There was a most interesting subject suggested the other day by the Secretary of State for War, and there was also the whole question of the defence of our secondary naval bases. There was in every fortress in modern times a book which showed why it was defended and how best it was to be defended. What was wanted by this Committee was that some record should be kept which should show the reason for every step that had been taken for the defence of the Empire. In that way only would it be possible to secure a continuous policy and prevent the present gross and scandalous waste of effort and money.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If I reply now it will prevent me speaking again. I may say at once that I have heard the encomiums paid to this Defence Committee by confident critics, who rightly regard it, as I emphatically desire the country to regard it, as being at present only in a tentative and relatively embryonic stage. I should write myself down a fool if I suggested for a moment that I am confident that we have reached the acme of organisation or that no additions or modifications were required in our arrangements. But that the Committee has done and is doing work which seems to me to be of the utmost value I can assure the House confidently, and when in due course our successors come into office and have the opportunity of seeing the records which we have left, whether they agree with our conclusions or not, they will feel that a great deal of work has been done by the Committee which, without the Committee, could never have been done at all. I must say how much in this matter we owe to the late Secretary of State for War, the present Secretary for India, and to the First Lord of the Admiralty. I do not say that the idea of this reform of the Committee originated wholly with them, because in matters of this kind almost every good invention has several legitimate fathers. But in a Cabinet Memorandum which they circulated they did more than any other two persons to start the movement upon a sound basis and whenever any one speaks with gratitude of the work of the Committee, they will not forget the names of the two Ministers of the Crown who deserve so much of the praise.

The hon. Member for Stepney asked me about the German general staff. I have never agreed with that phrase. While we have a great deal to learn from all the great military Powers on the Continent, it would be perfect folly on our part to try to model our arrangements on theirs. Our circumstances are different. Our Empire is different. Our whole political constitution is different. But while we ought to have our eyes and ears open to anything which they can teach us, a blind mechanical imitation would be the profoundest mistake which we could make. I do not contemplate that the Defence Committee can ever resemble the German general staff, partly because that staff is, if not wholly occupied with Army matters, at all events to the extent of 90 per cent. of its work so concerned. I think that my hon. friend need not fear that the Defence Committee will in any sense trench upon the responsibilities which properly lie in the first place with the Admiralty or the Army Department, and in the second remove with the Cabinet as a whole. In truth, I think that one of the great merits of the Defence Committee is that it has no executive authority at all. It has no power to give an order to the humblest soldier in His Majesty's Army or the most powerless sloop under the control of the Admiralty. I think that that is especially valuable from a point of view not yet touched upon—namely, the relations between the Defence Committee and those self-governing Colonies of the Empire over which no office in this country has any control at all. I hope that when any problem of defence which touches them nearly comes up, and even when they take a closer interest in the problems of Imperial defence as a whole, we may have the advantage of their assistance in our councils. But I am certain that the self-governing Colonies will never allow any representative of theirs to come to the Defence Committee if the Defence Committee with that addition had the smallest authority to impose obligations, financial, political, military, or naval, on the colonies which they represent. But we are so constituted that the only thing the Defence Committee may give, either to a Department at home or to the Cabinet or to the Colonial Governments, is advice.

It is quite true that, so far as the Home Departments are concerned, advice from a Committee which contains the Prime Minister, and which practically never meets without having the assistance of the Secretary of State for War, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the head of the Army general staff, the head of the Army Intelligence Department, the First Sea Lord, and the head of the Naval Intelligence Department—it is, I say, practically certain that a Committee so constituted is likely to have its advice taken by the Departments; but we have a great many functions to perform which go outside the jurisdiction of any of those offices. There are the self-governing Colonies, and anything they can do or are ready to do for Imperial defence. There is India. It is, no doubt, intimately connected with the problem of defence and with the Government of this country, but the Cabinet cannot give orders to India in the same sense, or with the same facility, or, indeed, in any way corresponding to the way in which they give orders to the First Lord of the Admiralty or the Secretary for War. It is, therefore, from that point of view of the very first importance that our functions should be so restricted that we cannot interfere with administration in any way either at home or abroad. It is only by thus strictly limiting our functions that we can have that authority which I hope we shall more and more gain in the general scheme of Imperial defence, and that our opinions will carry that weight which will be all the more effective because there is behind them no power of coercive authority.

It must be remembered—I make this remark, which, perhaps, is almost parenthetical in its character, because I do not want expectations raised—I am always anxious to keep expectations low about the work of the Defence Committee. I never wish to blow its trumpet or to exaggerate its merits; but may I remind the Committee that the questions we have to deal with are incomparably more difficult than those which fall to the general staff of the German Army? The main military problem with which they are daily and nightly occupied is, after all, relatively a simple one. They know exactly the number of their own troops and the number of the troops of the coterminous countries. They have every opportunity of learning about their discipline and efficiency, and they know the limited number of ways in which an invasion can be effected. Well, that is a very simple problem, but we have two problems which, I admit, are in a way almost as simple—namely, the problem of home defence and the problem of India. These are relatively isolated military and naval problems which can be considered, as it were, on their merits, and as questions which can be reasoned out round a table with some tolerable certainty that you have before you all the problems with which you will practically have to deal.

As regards home defence that was one of the very first things which the Committee took in hand. We discussed it at many consecutive meetings, and I finally drew up a full report embodying our view. That report will remain on record for the benefit of our successors, not indeed to bind them, but as a basis upon which they can make their own investigations upon a subject which changes from year to year, and on which no final conclusions ought even to be admitted, but which with the due revision which doubtless it will receive in years to come will, I think, always be ultimately based upon the conclusions at which we have arrived.

Then the other clear and definite problem with which we have to deal is the question of Indian defence. That was the only part of the right hon. Baronet's speech from which I felt myself at liberty to dissent. He ruled India out of the present practical military problems, on the ground, quite good as far as it goes, that the problem of the attack on India is largely a question of transport. So it is. But the right hon. Baronet must remember that, though it would be a very difficult, certainly a very serious, military problem for the Russians, our only possible enemy in that part of the world —though I trust that they will never be our enemy in fact—this country cannot allow the limit of countries which lie between us and Russia to be eaten up gradually, and these secondary bases to be made.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I do not wish to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman's argument, but I was replying to a statement of Lord Curzon that if these considerations should unfortunately at any time lead to war between ourselves and Russia that war must be fought out on the North-West Frontier of India. My observations suggested that Russia could be attacked in other parts of the world, and that it would not necessarily be on the North-West Frontier.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, but on the North-West Frontier, at all events of Afghanistan, the Russians, we have to admit, are strong and are every day tending to grow stronger. Their difficulty has always been one of transport. There was a time when the Russian invasion of India was a genuine scare, and a scare, I think, of the most foolish description, although some of the wisest of our forefathers were deeply impressed by it. But the Russia of which they were afraid was, from the point of view of transport, which the right hon. Gentleman most rightly thinks is the key to the whole situation, a very different Russia from the Russia of to-day. They have already one line of railway directly meeting the frontier of Afghanistan, and they are on the verge of having a second line of railway directly meeting that frontier, and it is possible, in future, that these means of communication, so important to increase, may be increased further. Everybody will recognise that I am discussing an abstract military problem. Every nation in the world which is coterminous with a military Power has to assume, for the sake of argument, that some day or other they may be at war, and I am acting on that assumption. The problem of the defence of India from invasion from the North-west cannot be dismissed in the phrases which have been used, I think, by the right hon. Baronet, and which certainly were used by the hon. and gallant Gentleman behind me. The right hon. Baronet in this regard made a solemn and well-founded appeal to the Government not to be guided too much by expert opinion. I think we ought not to be too much guided by expert opinion; and one of the great advantages of the Defence Committee is that your chief sailors, soldiers, and politicians are brought together round a table. I have known great soldiers who, when you pointed out to them that such and such a course was really practically impossible on account of the cost it involved, or for some other reason, said:—"That is not my affair, but your affair. I have only got to deal with the ideal army as it ought to be." Nobody has got to deal in this world with an ideal case. He has to deal with the thing he can get, and he has to make the best of it. One immense advantage of these informal conversations around a table by the chiefs of the Army and Navy, and those who are responsible for the time being for the conduct of public affairs, is that each comes into direct contact with the point of view of the other, each is subjected to the cross-examination of the other, each can be forced to give his own opinion in writing, and, finally, when some kind of conclusion is arrived at—and all our conclusions are, or ought to be, provisional—that conclusion, at all events, is the result of prolonged conversations embodied in formal documents in which all the reasons as regards the main question—I do not mean as regards each particular question—are set out. Those seem to me to be the main points that have been raised in this debate. If any further questions are asked, I shall be glad to do my best to answer them, but I have endeavoured to give as material an insight as I can into the existing practice and working of the Committee, which has met every week since it has been reconstituted, and has done work, far indeed from covering the whole complicated question of Imperial defence, but which will prove of use either to us or our successors.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): The last part of the Prime Minister's speech, I think, has touched the real point, and given us what is the essence of the reasons for the establishment of the Defence Committee. I could not help thinking, when he alluded to the value of the informal conversations across the table of the Defence Committee, that we are having this evening a sort of informal conversation rather than a debate of a most interesting and informing kind. Though I have some reserves to make, I would submit to the Committee whether one of the first fruits of the work of the Defence Committee which we may very well welcome is not the sort of speech we have had from the Prime Minister this evening, a speech which was informing and interesting to the House, not pressing the Committee for any conclusions, not committing them to anything, but a really informing and educating speech, very tentative in its character. But I would ask the Committee to think whether the sort of speech we have had from the Prime Minister is not one which might be very greatly expanded by future Prime Ministers when the Defence Committee has been longer at work. The Prime Minister has removed one apprehension which may have weighed with some Members who have not been altogether satisfied with the appointment of the Defence Committee. He has said that the Defence Committee is to have no executive power. Well, if it has no executive power, I trust I am justified in saying that it has removed nothing from the control of the House of Commons.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Prime Minister dwelt on the question of the Indian frontier. I should like to give a little more definiteness as to what he said as to questions of policy on the Indian frontier. We wish on this side of the House, and I hope the feeling is shared on the other side, to regard the problem of the Indian frontier as one of defence.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

SIR EDWARD GREY: We have heard it suggested that there have been military circles which regarded the Indian problem as one not solely of defence but as a question of how you might, in the course of certain eventualities, be prepared to press home an attack on Russia. If the Imperial Defence Committee has provided the means by which policy may be so considered that you can have a statement definitely before the House that the problem of the Indian frontier is one of defence, you have something definite in the way of policy to put before the House which we have never yet had put before it, because we have had no opportunity previously of discussing these questions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cheered the right hon. Gentleman because I agreed with him, and then it occurred to me that, as a cheer is necessarily inarticulate, my agreement might be misunderstood. The problem of the North-West Frontier, is, in our opinion, purely a question of defence, but that does not mean that the defence is necessarily to be conducted behind that frontier.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I admit that we are in an early stage. This is a problem which has really never been discussed in the House, but the point of view I want to put forward is this—that the problem of defence is very different from the problem of an advance beyond the frontier. If it is defence you have got the whole of the difficulties of the frontier on your side. They are an asset in your defence. That is the sort of problem we expect to be considered by the new Committee of Defence and the sort of problem which we expect to receive new definiteness and new clearness in the way it is presented to the House of Commons.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Prime Minister said, and I do not intend to disturb the impression, that the Vote now before the Committee has been received with considerable sympathy, but I cannot go quite so far as the Esher Committee has gone. They have, I think, been a little anticipatory in their congratulations upon the appointment of the Committee of Defence. It is still in its infancy, and the House of Commons will welcome it not by its establishment but by its results. We have not yet got the results, and we must wait for them before we can quite rise to the pitch of the

Esher Committee in welcoming the establishment of the Committee of Defence. One result we have already got. We have already got a discussion, not merely of Army questions or of Navy questions, but of the two combined. The House of Commons has never been able to discuss questions of defence as a whole. It is sometimes asked—Is it, after all, very important that the House of Commons should discuss such questions? I stand by discussion in the House of Commons, because without discussion there is no control. But discussion is also an opportunity for keeping the House of Commons in touch with important problems. It is an opportunity to the Government of the day for educating the House of Commons. Speeches from the Government, whatever the Government may be, carry considerable weight in the House of Commons, and they have an educative and informing effect upon the country at large. The House of Commons and the country have never had a chance yet of being instructed and informed on the question of Imperial defence. The result has been that the House of Commons has been most inefficient in its criticism and control of Army and Navy Estimates, because it has had no real policy which it could make a starting point for its criticism. I look upon the Defence Committee, if rightly used—because everything depends upon that—as being a possible instrument by which you may secure efficiency and economy. That is what we want. What we are oppressed by is a sense of waste caused by overlapping between the two services. We have had vast preparations; we have had no plan behind them, and that must entail waste. If the Defence Committee is rightly used it ought to give us a plan, and ought therefore to make our preparations both more efficient and more economical.

There is one point of view with regard to the Defence Committee which may excite apprehension. Hon. Members may say, "You have already your War Office making very large and enormous demands upon the expenditure of the country; you have your Admiralty also making very large demands; you are now going to create a third body, which is going to add to the demands." That is the point I want to deal with. You have already two Departments making, as I consider, conjointly, in the total, excessive demands upon the expenditure of the country. If you are going to add a third which is to make separate demands, I admit I should demur to that exceedingly. But, rightly used, I think the Imperial Defence Committee ought to so lay down the policy as to restrict the Army and the Navy respectively, and consolidate these two separate demands into one great demand for Imperial defence, which will in its total be less than the two separate demands. Therefore it is as a possible instrument for efficiency and economy that I look upon the Defence Committee. There is one more possible objection. I can understand people saying: "You have got your Defence Committee; it is to have a permanent secretary, who will be a very powerful man. When one Government goes out of power it will leave behind it records laying down propositions with regard to Imperial defence which will be an almost insuperable obstacle to its successor if its successor takes a different view of the needs of Imperial defence." In other words, that it will settle such a degree of continuity of policy that one Government will be able more than it can now to bind its successor. But successive Governments now come in committed to enormous Army Estimates and enormous Navy Estimates, and I do not see that the continuity of policy, because it is gathered into one hand, is likely to be a more insuperable bar to future economy than it is now, when you have it in two separate Departments which have never been under any real control. The Imperial Defence Committee must never be allowed to become an independent machine which is to run the Government. It must be an instrument to be used by the Government, and the person on whom the responsibility will rest for seeing that it is used for the Government is undoubtedly the Prime Minister. I quite admit that with a Committee of this kind, with a permanent secretary who is an able and powerful man, you have the danger that with a weak Government the Defence Committee may become the master of the Government.

It is so with the permanent officials of any Department, and it rests with the Prime Minister to see that nothing of that kind takes place.

I think we ought not to pass by the question of the appointment of the Defence Committee without at least a tribute to the memory of Lord Randolph Churchill, with whom, if I may judge from the Report of the Esher Committee, the germ of the idea really rests. He recommended that in the interests of economy—because he was a great economist—you should co-ordinate the Army and the Navy under one head, and he recommended a Minister of Defence who should be supreme over both. I am not sure that I consider the reason which the Esher Committee have given for dismissing that suggestion is sufficient; I think it is a possible alternative well worthy of consideration. The first question that will arise in the minds of us all is why nothing of this kind has been done before. I am glad the Prime Minister has not used the argument, which he has used in other matters, that this is solely the proposal of the present Government and that nothing of the kind has been suggested by the Liberal Party. But I would point out that in the last twenty years the Liberal Party has only been in office for two complete sessions of Parliament. Therefore when I say that the question arises in our minds, Why has nothing of the kind been done before?—I would deprecate any retort against the Liberal Party, for no reproach rests with them in the matter.

The Prime Minister is to be the President of the Defence Committee. The Esher Committee says that the Prime Minister ought always to be President. I do not think we need anticipate the future in that fashion. It is quite right that for the present the Prime Minister should be President. The Defence Committee has to overtake an immense amount of arrears; its business is to introduce both efficiency and economy, and that being so its work ought to be directly supervised, not only by the present Prime Minister, but by any Prime Minister that may succeed him in earlier years. I speak with the freedom of one who has never been a Cabinet Minister, and therefore from the point of view of an ordinary citizen, when I say that the Prime Minister is the most important Minister of the whole Cabinet. Therefore, whatever Department has for the moment the most important work to do, that Department ought to have the constant attention of the Prime Minister. The work of the Defence Committee is one specially for the superintendence of the Prime Minister. It may be that in happier times such superintendence will be unnecessary, and, that being so, I do not see why the Prime Minister should necessarily always remain the active president of the Defence Committee. But we shall never get economy and efficiency in expenditure unless the Prime Minister for a time superintends closely the work of the Defence Committee. This will bring him into contact with the naval experts and the military experts, and it may be said that if he is weak they will get the better of him, and lead him into extravagant expenditure. You cannot provide against that. You can no more provide against a weak or an incompetent Prime Minister than against a weak or incompetent admiral. But the Prime Minister is less likely to be run by the experts if he is brought into contact with them than if he meets them at the Defence Committee. Any Government which proposes large reductions in the expenditure on the Army and Navy will be confronted with great difficulties. It is one thing to ask for reductions; it is another thing to propose them in the House of Commons. The Government who propose them will have great difficulties unless the Prime Minister has been fortified by contact with the naval and military experts of the Defence Committee. If the Prime Minister is able to say that the Estimates he presents to the House are Estimates which the Defence Committee consider sufficient for the defence of the Empire, he will convince the House that they are brought forward, not in the interest of economy alone, but are sufficient also for the needs of the Empire. The scheme must be judged by its results. I am not sure that it is the best thing that might have been devised, but until this was devised there were no means by which the House of Commons might have a policy as a whole put before it and might be really placed in a position to judge of the needs of Imperial defence. In so far as it is to be used as a means for economy and as a means for putting before the House of Commons annually the problem of Imperial defence, I welcome and support it.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said he most heartily welcomed the Defence Committee. He thought that the Defence Committee would be able to obviate the delay which had occurred in the past in connection with the calling out of the Reserves, whereby many thousands of lives had been lost. He, however, differed from the feeling which appeared to be accepted at the present time that this country could rely on the Navy alone. The sanity of the nation would never permit it. He was very glad indeed that the Secretary of State for War proposed to keep a force of Regulars in this country. This country had been invaded on several occasions. In Mahan's Life of Nelson it was supposed that an enemy 40,000 strong could cross on a calm night very rapidly. Therefore, they should not run away with the idea that this country could rely for defence on the Navy alone. If the Navy were on the spot it might be all right; but in the event of a long war the Cabinet would be asked to send ships to reinforce fleets in the Atlantic, the North Sea, or the Mediterranean; and after a time very few ships would be left.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that the proposal of a Defence Committee had been very favourably received by the Committee as a whole. He thought it was one of the fruits of the discussions, the acrimonious discussions, they had had last session. It was those discussions which directed the attention of the Prime Minister to military affairs.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said his attention was aroused long before the discussions to which the hon. Gentleman referred.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that certainly the result did not mature until then, or had not sufficiently matured to enable the right hon. Gentleman to hold the views he now held. The Report of the Esher Committee showed that the criticisms which they had directed against Army policy were altogether right; and that they marched abreast of military sentiment. The Prime Minister said that the present Secretary of State for India had a share in the credit for this Committee. That might be quite true. Nobody knew how much he might have recommended; but certain he was that the right hon. Gentleman by endeavouring to stereotype into the Army system all the expansions made under stress of war directed a large amount of attention to the Army, so that in that sense he might claim for himself to have been the parent of the recent reform. The secretariat which the Prime Minister had created, for he would be looked upon as the principal creator, was put forward by him in a very inoffensive manner and in a manner which had been recognised and praised by the right hon. Baronet. The Prime Minister had said it was a modest proposal; it was because they thought the secretariat a modest proposal and because it was not regarded as being a revolutionary change that it had received such a large measure of support from all shades of military opinion in the House. The hon. Member for Stepney had spoken of the scale and scope of the Committee, and suggested that it would be a great danger if it were to be a parallel to the German general staff. He was sure every one would agree with that. The utility of this secretariat would be destroyed if it departed from being an advisory machine at the service of the Cabinet. It might be true that there were great miscalculations of the forces required to overcome the Boers. but he was not sure that those miscalculations would have been prevented by such a secretariat. He had always defended the general military conduct of the first portion of the war, terminating with the capture of Pretoria. The miscalculations were moral rather than material, and were not matters upon which the secretariat of strategists would necessarily be able to give proper and accurate information.

One danger about this secretariat was that it was n instrument which, though it might be used in the interests of economy, might equally be used for the purpose of expanding expenditure and establishment. There was also the possibility of too great attention on the part of the Prime Minister to the details of Imperial defence. The present head of the secretariat, who was a man of great capacity, vigour, and energy, might be said to exhibit at once the advantages and disadvantages of his office. By his very qualities he would obtain a predominant influence over the men who ruled the Army and governed the policy of the country. It would be of great value to the Minister in charge to have such a man at his elbow, but it was very possible that he would become the real brain and governing spirit of Army policy. He understood that the officers to be employed were to be not of high rank, and were to return to their regiments at the expiration of their period of service. The tremendous secrets with which the Committee would have to deal would therefore be entrusted in the course of time to a considerable number of officers. That was a serious, though perhaps not an insuperable, objection. It would be much better that these officers should be on the general staff, and after their term of service should return thereto, as there were considerable dangers connected with such officers, on returning to their regiment, discussing points of strategy in the confidence of the mess-room, dangers which must be apparent to all.

Another consideration was that connected with the presidency of the Committee. He could well believe that the present Prime Minister, being greatly interested in these matters, and having a mind trained in dealing with all sorts of great problems, was the best man that could be found for that office. But, after all, very few Prime Ministers would possess the aptitude or the taste for the kind of work involved. It frequently happened in this country that the man who was made Prime Minister was appointed to that position not because he was the most vigorous and perspicacious person who could be found, but because he had come to represent certain great principles and stood for a certain kind of Government. For that very reason he was generally a somewhat aged man, not much fitted to go into great masses of detail of a highly technical character. The Minority Report of the Hartington Commission would have avoided the difficulty by placing the land and sea forces of the Crown under a Minister of Defence who should also be the treasurer of those forces. But the advantages of the course now being taken were overwhelming. It would provide an opportunity for discussion in the House of Commons, and, by providing a much needed link between the two services, afford the possibility of there one day being established a more reasonable ratio between the naval and military expenditure of the country.

Mr. Winston Churchill.

He was glad to hear that this Committee would have no sort of executive power. It was to be a body of men trained to inform the executive authority. The Cabinet had the issues of peace and war in its hands. Was it to decide these matters on knowledge or in ignorance? If on knowledge it must be allowed to select the best methods of obtaining a regular supply of the knowledge required in the most convenient form. That would undoubtedly be provided by this Committee and no one would be inclined to grudge the comparatively insignificant annual cost involved. He did not deny that it would be foolish for the country to pin their faith entirely to the blue water school; it would at any rate be a great pity that they should entirely blot out of their minds the responsibility which morally devolved upon every citizen to defend the soil on which he lived. He had always strongly urged that it was in the development of a great Volunteer citizen Army, living not in barracks, but in tents, coming up for temporary training and not serving as professional soldiers, that they would find the insurance against the very improbable contingency of invasion, and also an outlet for that invaluable manly sentiment without which no nation could really be considered patriotic. The invasion school was very popular last year, and was mainly responsible for the theory of the then Secretary of State for War as to the necessity of having 30,000 "stiffeners" to be spread about among the Volunteer forces of the country to enable them to resist invasion. The absurdity of having so overwhelming a command of the sea that we could transport three Army Corps to India, and, at the same time, so miserable and ineffective a command of the sea that we were exposed to invasion, was vividly exposed on one occasion by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, an exposure which probably led to the abandonment of the theory.

He recognised, as every hon. Member of the House must recognise, how presumptuous it was for a Member of Parliament to attempt to deal with this question. If India was invaded with a small force then there was an Army large enough on the spot to deal with it; and on the other hand, if it was invaded by a great force then there must be time allowed to collect transport railways, and obtain the most elaborate information for a great defence. During the course of the late war the Prime Minister made a speech at Manchester for which he was very much abused, and in which he stated that it was not possible for this country to be ready to meet attacks everywhere at a moment's notice, and he said all that was necessary was to have enough troops on the spot to make sure that they could hold out until the vast forces of the British Empire could be brought into the field. Those were the lines on which this question ought to be approached. The Army on which we might have to depend in time of war would bear no relation to the hidebound armies of the War Office. We could put far more troops into the field than any War Office would ever boast that we could. We must realise that it was on armies of improvisation that we should have to depend for great emergencies. The military system which we should adopt ought accordingly to bear a much closer resemblance to that of the United States than to that of European nations. The United States relied on a small Regular army and the power in time of emergency to levy masses of the citizens, trusting to the size of their country and their isolation for time to develop great armies. In the same way we might rely on our isolation and our Navy for time to develop our resources.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said the utility of a scheme of this kind could only be proved by experience. A Committee of this kind was very valuable to the nation, and the Prime Minister deserved every credit not only for devising this scheme, but also for giving his time and energy to it after calling it into being. They were, however, to a large extent in the dark as to the work of this Committee, and of course there must be a certain amount of reserve in regard to it. It was evident that at least in one department of Government we had now got something like a scientific approach to a great problem. The first result for which the country would look would be a definite pronouncement in regard to the relations of the Army and the Navy. There was nothing more deplorable in the history of their finances than the millions which had been wasted owing to an imperfect conception of what our naval and military policy ought to be, and all for the want of some body which would combine the supreme naval and military talent of the nation, and which ought to apply itself to the production of a national scheme of defence. The Prime Minister was entitled to every credit for having conceived such a body, and it was for the House to see that that body gave them something like a definite result. On a body like that they had a chance of bringing the Imperial policy of the defence of the country into some kind of relationship with the Colonies. He had always felt that a great step was taken when the Canadian Minister sat upon this Committee a short time ago. The Defence Committee ought not to be a rigid body, but ought to be able to come into relation with the distant parts of the Empire.

Nothing was more natural than that its creator, the Prime Minister, should be an integral part of the Committee. But was it essential that the Prime Minister should be stereotyped as the head of the Committee? The Committee should contain the heads of the two services, and should be in close relation with the Finance Minister. If there was one thing required upon this body it was economy, and unless they made provision for the influence of those responsible for economy and efficiency upon the organisation of this body, the Committee would not be a success. The presence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was essential in the case of a Committee of this kind. Upon him depended how much cloth they had got to cut their coat from, and this showed the necessity of the Prime Minister keeping an open mind as to the shape this Committee was to assume in the future. He could see enormous advantages in the introduction of the element of permanence and continuity into our policy of Imperial defence. He thought this discussion had been a valuable one because it had allowed an interchange of ideas not all upon a Party basis, but with the idea of making the most of an institution which for the first time had been brought into existence in this country. He hoped that it would be possible to have many more such discussions as they learned more and more of the work of the Committee. Of course, the details of the work of this Committee were much better kept secret, but if this Committee was worth anything at all they would see the effect of its deliberations in the general policy adopted. They would see the result in the Estimates of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to our naval and military requirements, and in plans of co-ordination of which in the past they had had too little experience. If those aspirations were realised then they would know something of the existence of this Committee. As those materials were placed before Parliment they would be able to judge whether this Committee had been a success or not. Of course, there must necessarily be a great deal of reserve about a scheme which could only be judged by how it worked in practice. They did not grudge the Prime Minister the credit for having called something new into existence, and for having thrown his energy into the accomplishment of a scheme of this kind, and they looked forward confidently to the fruition of the seed which he had sown. They would watch the results very closely, and he trusted that in this new instrument they had found something by which good results would be accomplished not only for this country, but for the most distant parts of the Empire.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.) said that fears had been expressed that the Committee of Defence would throw a great deal of work upon the Prime Minister, and hon. Members had expressed doubts whether the right hon. Gentleman would be able to devote that amount of attention which was necessary to make its work successful. He though they might congratulate themselves upon the Ministerial side of the House upon having a Prime Minister who had devoted a great deal of time and attention to the work of this Committee, and if he continued that attention and was kept in power by a majority of this House then they had no fear upon that score. The hon. Member for Oldham said that the Prime Minister ought to be a young man, and that he must have had some military experience to qualify him for the work of this Committee. It seemed to him that if a Liberal Government came into power they might select the hon. Member for Oldham as a person who fulfilled those two conditions. After all, one of the principal duties of the Prime Minister was to see to the security of the country. It was also part of the business of the Prime Minister to see that the finances of the country were properly and economically administered. In a matter of this kind a good deal depended upon the men who ran the machine, and to have a secretary to this Committee like the one they had got was a very great improvement upon anything which they had had in the past. This system secured a proper record of what had been done in the past, and this must be greatly to the advantage of the Empire. He did not think he was mistaken when he said that he thought there had been a good deal of misapprehension in regard to the exact functions of this Committee. It had been said that the working of this Committee was to be analogous to the working of the general staff in the German and other foreign armies, but from what the Prime Minister had said that was evidently not the case. This Committee was simply to be an organisation for the collection of information for the Prime Minister and the Cabinet itself. In that respect it rather corresponded not so much to the general staff of the German army, but to the military committee of the German Emperor. At the same time he was very glad to hear the Prime Minister say that they did not intend to adhere too slavishly to foreign methods. The defence of this Empire was a totally different thing to the defence of any other nation. A comparison had been made with Japan, but the Japanese had no Empire abroad and no colonies, and in that respect the British Empire was perfectly distinct from any other country in the world.

Mr. **LOUGH** (Islington, W.) said that upon this question he was hardly able to take the same view as that which had been expressed by some of his colleagues. If anything could have persuaded him to give a hearty approval to this Committee it would have been the speech of his right hon. friend the Member for Berwick. He had insisted that this Committee should be judged by its results, which could only be seen by the plans laid before the House for Imperial defence, by the reduction of expenditure, and by the co-ordination of the services, which would tend to the improvement of both. They had heard similar observations from other right hon. Gentlemen and hon. Members who had spoken upon this subject. He had examined the Paper circulated by the Prime Minister upon this question, and he had listened to his speech, but he had failed to find the slightest justification for the high hopes which hon. Members had expressed. The Prime Minister had promised to answer any further Questions upon this subject. The right hon. Gentleman had not said anything about co-ordinating the naval and military forces, and he had not said that there would be any reduction in expenditure. This Committee had been in existence for some seven years, and he wished to ask the Prime Minister if he could give the Committee any information as to the work the Committee had been doing during those years?

Mr. A. J. **BALFOUR**: The present Committee is a wholly different one.

Mr **LOUGH** asked if the Committee had come to any decisions. There had not been any reduction in the national expenditure. He thought a fuller description of the work of this Committee should be given to them than they had got. One paragraph in the circular which had been issued said that any information required by the Committee from a Department would be procured in such a manner as the head of the Department would from time to time direct. Why such a limitation? Why should this body not be able to obtain this information unless the head of the Department desired to give it? This Committee was to make continuity of method possible. Did that mean in the treatment of naval and military expenditure? Why was there not some report made to the House of Commons? They had heard nothing of the real work of the Committee except what was contained in a great many imaginary speeches. The Prime Minister had said that this Committee had met every week, but they had not heard what had been done. He wished to know how their work was going to reduce expenditure. He was suspicious of the very name of this Committee. It was called the Defence Committee, but defence against what and whom? This country was perhaps the greatest Power in the world, but to his mind this word "defence" was analogous to the word "attack." He was very much afraid that the work of this Committee would not be carried on in the careful spirit which had been described to-night by everybody but its author. The Prime Minister had not made any such promises, and he had not given any such glowing account of its work. When reference was made to the Indian frontier the Prime Minister said that it must not be considered that their policy of defence was confined to one side of the frontier alone. Did he think that the best way of defending India was to annex Tibet? The right hon. Gentleman said that the Committee was very restricted in its power, and that too much must not be expected from it. All the House had been furnished with up to the present was the cost of the Department. They ought to have a little more information as to the extravagant basis upon which this Department had been placed, and the Prime Minister ought to tell the Committee something about the relationship between the Committee of Defence and the great Government spending Departments. Every speech had turned upon questions of economy, but the Prime Minister had told them nothing about this question. He wished to know if the formation of this Committee held out the slightest hope of any reduction in the Estimates.

Mr. **COURTENAY WARNER** (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that upon a Committee of this kind it was necessary that the Prime Minister should be strong enough to insist upon a reduction of expenditure, and not listen so much to military and naval advisers. The right hon. Baronet had said that debates such as this led not only to education of the House of Commons, but also of the country, and that was a most important thing at the present moment, because the wildest ideas prevailed as to what was required for the defence of this country. There was another great advantage, and it was that the House would have the opportunity of impressing upon the controlling member of that Committee important points which the House and the country thought were necessary in relation to our defence. Then there was the expenditure on naval and military works, and the want of co-ordination of that expenditure with the ordinary work of the War Office and the Admiralty. This Committee might do something to stop the confusion of these Estimates, and they might place naval and military expenditure under one head. If this Committee had existed before he thought the late Lord Salisbury would have taken great interest in our military preparations, and the Government would not have been in that state of ignorance in which they entered upon the South African War. Another important point was that the assistance of the Colonies in regard to national defence would be brought more into harmony, and they would probably be able to get more assistance from the Colonies through this Committee informing them what was wanted. The Treasury Minute stated that this was to be a consultative and advisory Committee. He hoped they would be consultative and advisory, not only to the Government, but that the House would get the benefit of a little of their advice. Many Members of the House were not intimately acquainted with Army matters, and they wanted the advice of somebody in touch with the military advisers of the Crown. What an enormous advantage it would have been to the Secretary of State for War if he had been able to know the number of infantry, cavalry, and guns required for the South African War. One of the duties of the Committee would be to ascertain these things accurately. He thanked the Prime Minister for the information he had given that night. In days gone by the Defence Committee had been praised over and over again, but until that night they had not been told what their work was. The speech of the Prime Minister was exactly what they wanted in that House. They desired information as to what the Committee were doing and were likely to do. They should like to have a statement as to what were the forces required, but if they could not get that, at least let them know something of what was going on, and show that the Committee was not a mere sham to cover up the deficiencies of other Departments.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked that a reply should be given to the Question raised by the hon. Member for West Islington. He noticed that one of the old bad faults of the Estimates had been revived. There was a footnote in regard to the salary received by the secretary of the Defence Committee. The late Mr. Hanbury and the hon. Member for King's Lynn had always attacked the method of contracting the amount of the face of the Estimates in the way followed in this case. He must say that it was a great disappointment to him that an Estimate of this kind should be brought in. If the post was worth £2,000, that amount ought to be put into the Estimates. The present method falsified the Estimates, and he hoped the Prime Minister would be able to give the Committee some explanation of this Vote. He begged to move to reduce the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,860, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought he could show that the broad position which the Government had taken up was justified. It was perfectly true that they ought, as far as possible, to avoid having special salaries for individuals different from those normally attaching to the office. But when they were starting a new office, and they thought they had found the man specially competent to fill it, it was absolutely necessary to take into account his actual position. Sir George Clarke was Governor of Victoria when he was summoned home by telegraph to take part in the Esher

Commission. He gave up an extremely good place, and he asked neither fee nor reward for his services. That had to be taken into account when the Government asked him to accept his present place. It was impossible for him to draw the pension which he had earned; and the Government felt that when they summoned Sir George Clarke to undertake this new office, they had a man possessing very special qualifications for it—a man of great tact and knowledge who had the confidence of his own profession and of the Navy.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said it might be that this was a very fair salary to pay Sir George Clarke; but the Committee did not know what his functions were. The point was that they were passing a Vote for £1,500 and they were paying £2,000. If Sir George Clarke was to be paid £2,000 as secretary of the Defence Committee, why had a Vote for £2,000 not been put down in the Estimates? Let it be shown, on the Paper itself, what was the sum the Committee was really voting. If they took up any ordinary town Council's accounts, they knew exactly what was being paid; but here they did not know what was actually being paid. He trusted his hon. friend would press his Motion to a division as a protest against this method of keeping the Imperial accounts.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he shared the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman as to Sir George Clarke's special qualifications, and no one could take exception to the salary paid to him. What they objected to was this slipshod method of bookkeeping. There were very valid objections to the payment of personal salaries. If £2,000 was to be paid to Sir George Clarke, that salary should be fixed and continued to the succeeding secretaries; otherwise it might be a premium to another Minister to chose a less efficient secretary. There was another instance of a distinguished officer who drew a personal salary, Lord Roberts still continued to draw his salary as Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Although that distinguished soldier had a right to very exceptional treatment, especially when they considered the way in which he had been bundled out of the War Office, it seemed to him that if they were going to give personal salaries to distinguished public servants, over and above their ordinary salaries, there would be a very serious leakage. He did not wish to make any reflection on Sir George Clarke or to cast any doubt on the question of his qualifications, but he protested against the system of personal salaries, and it was necessary to make a protest in that connection. There should be a fixed rule from which there should be no departure. Sir George Clarke was not the only distinguished servant the country had. There were men at the Treasury who were often consulted on matters outside their own Department. There was, for instance, the Mowatt Committee, which was entirely outside the work of the Treasury and for which no salary was given. The salary which was given to Sir George Clarke was given in consideration of his organisation of the new Department. But he would not do any more than any public servant. For instance, the Department of Agriculture was organised, but he did not know that the first occupant of the secretaryship received a larger salary than his successors. His objection was not personal to Sir George Clarke. If it were true that his services could not be secured for less than £2,000 the proper course was to make that the salary. But if it were possible to get an equally good man at a lower figure then the salary should be reduced. In any event he desired to enter his protest against the system of personal salaries.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) said he wished to explain that the Committee had before it the sum to be voted for the salary actually paid to Sir George Clarke, and in another column the salary which was considered normal for the post and which would be assigned to his successor. He agreed that it was desirable as a general rule to have a fixed salary for any given post, open to review from time to time when circumstances arose, but it was not in the interest of the public service that they should be deprived of the advantage of obtaining the help of a particular man who had special qualifications for a particular post because the normal salary of the post might be insufficient. They believed that £1,500 normally would be a sufficient salary. If it should be found impossible, when Sir George Clarke retired, to fill the post with a really competent and able man at that salary, the Government then in power would have to consider whether they ought to propose a higher salary.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said he wished to warn the Committee that if they allowed exceptional treatment in one case they would pay through the nose for it. He did not object to this salary, but he noticed that the only advantage which the country had hitherto derived from the Committee of Defence was the payment of a new salary. A personal salary would lead to a great deal of favouritism. He knew perfectly well that if a man had a friend he thought he was deserving of a larger salary than another man. Lord Palmerston was once asked if he always gave positions to the best man, and he replied "invariably." He was then asked how he knew that the men he appointed were the best men; and he replied, "The man I like best is the best man." Personal salaries would carry the system of favouritism right through every Department of the State. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Oldham said that he did not object to the salary. He himself did. They had had organisation and reorganisation of the Army, and they now found that further reorganisation was necessary. He took exception to putting the control of these matters into the hands of civilians. His idea of the reorganisation of the Army would be that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should say what sum could be afforded, and that military experts should then give us the best result they could for the money. If they obtained half-a-dozen Japanese sergeants and committed the task to them, they would be far more likely to produce an effective and a cheap Army than the right hon. Gentleman who had said that that was his ambition. When the new reorganisation had been carried out the Army might be more efficient, but it would not be cheaper.

Sir EDWARD GREY said that if he were as pessimistic as the hon. Member for Northampton he would be exceedingly unhappy. He could not compete with his hon. friend in his knowledge of the organisation of the Japanese Army, with which he appeared to be thoroughly acquainted. But he was quite prepared to admit, on hypothesis, that there was a good deal to be learned from the Japanese. He agreed with the objection raised in this case to the system. He did not see why the salary of Sir George Clarke should not have been stated in the Estimates as £2,000, with a note to the effect that the future salary of the office would be £1,500. He thought that £1,500 was a sufficient salary for a secretary. But he agreed with the Prime Minister that if they asked a man of the capacity of Sir George Clarke to fill the office they could not offer him less than the salary it was proposed to give him. Regarding as he did the Department as in its infancy, but with great possibilities for the future, he could not vote for the reduction moved by his hon. friend. The Estimate was a small one, but it ought to lead to a reduction of some millions in expenditure, and if it did not produce that result in a short time he should then join in the protest of his hon. friends. He regarded the Committee as having great possibilities. He agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean as to the manner in which its work might develop; therefore he was not prepared to vote for any reduction at present. He would judge by results, and if those results were not satisfactory he would be prepared on a subsequent occasion to take a different line.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had somewhat misrepresented the objection taken to this proposal. Three reasons had been urged for this larger salary, first, Sir George Clarke's personal character and peculiar qualifications; secondly, the fact that he had given up a valuable and important position in Australia; and, thirdly, that he had had to organise a new Department. If a personal salary was to be given to this office, the grounds on which that step was taken ought to be defined with the utmost precision, so that they could be referred to on subsequent occasions. If that were done it would to some extent modify his objection to the Vote in its present form.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) objected to the creation of a strong and powerful office in the secretariat to the Defence Committee. Ministers came and went—the present Ministers did not, but under ordinary circumstances Ministers did come and go; the experts would have only a limited term of office, but the secretary would be always there, and if he was a strong man he would practically be Commander-in-Chief of both Navy and Army. Any new Minister desirous of instituting a change of policy would find great difficulty in dealing with this permanent officer. He thought the proper Committee of Defence was the Cabinet—not the mass meeting of Conservatives at present so designated, but a Cabinet kept within reasonable limits; and that, he believed, was the proper body to co-ordinate the policy of the Admiralty and the War Departments.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 48; Noes, 149. (Division List No. 294.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cullinan, J.
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Griffith, Ellis J.
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Dowd, John
Randles, John S.
Roberts John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Brampton Gurdon and Mr. J. H. Whitley.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham

Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Co. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan,David J(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Norman, Henry
Pemberton, John S.G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley,HonM.W.(Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G. (Oxf'dUniv
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley,H. (Ashton und.Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 133; Noes, 59. (Division List No. 295.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen,AugustusHenry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour,RtHn Gerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell,J.H.M. (DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane,Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir Horatio D(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hon.Sir JosephC
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S(Warwick.S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Green, WalfordD.(Wednesbury
Greene,Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq.of L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hn. Claude George
Heath,ArthurHoward (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope,J.F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn.W.F.
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan,David J(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon.M.W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cullinan, J.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Partick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Churchill and Mr. J. H. Whitley.

Question put accordingly, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,960, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Expenses in respect of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in the Department of His Majesty's Treasury," and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Friday; Committee to sit again this day.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (MONEY).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) who rose amid Opposition cries of "Grey," said that he wished to make a statement which he had previously promised to make. Under a series of Acts of Parliament it had directed that certain works should be executed and the cost of them charged to capital to be repaid within a minimum period of years. For the purpose of providing this money the Treasury was only authorised to borrow on a single form of security—terminable annuities That was not now a marketable form of security. They had been wholly taken up in the past by the National Debt Commissioners. The funds at the command of the Commissioners were no longer sufficient for the purpose, and he was, therefore, obliged to ask the Committee to authorise the Treasury to borrow on a different form of security—namely, Exchequer bonds. As to the amount of capital expenditure, the figure of £10,000,000 which he gave during the discussion on the Budget had been somewhat reduced. The amount which it would probably be necessary to borrow would be £9,250,000—£4,500,000 on account of the Naval Works Act, £3,500,000 on account of the Military Works Act, £750,000 on account of the Telegraph Acts, £219,000 under the Uganda Railway Act, £17,000 on account of Land Registry Buildings, £197,000 under the Public Buildings Expenses Act, and £50,000 under the Public Offices (Government) Act. All these works had been approved, and all the borrowing authorised by Parliament. He moved a Resolution authorising the Treasury to borrow by means of

Exchequer bonds any sums which they were authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sums which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had raised a point with which he was not familiar, and which was of some novelty. He rose for the purpose of moving to report Progress, although not necessarily to ask the Prime Minister to close business. But there was a long programme on the Paper, and they ought to have some statement from the Government as to how much of that programme they proposed to take. This novel point could not be discussed at so late an hour. He thought that there should be some discrimination as to the kind of business to be taken at these late sittings.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Edward Grey.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he did not altogether disagree with the observations of the right hon. Baronet, and he thought the right hon. Baronet's objection was a very reasonable one. He, however, did not propose to ask the House to do more than pass the preliminary Resolution standing on the Paper. The right hon. Baronet said that the hour was late, but discussion could be made on the Second Reading, Report, and Third Reading of these Bills—the Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill, the Cunard Agreement (Money) Bill, and the Anglo-French Convention (Expenses) Bill. Under these circumstances he asked the Committee to agree to passing this Resolution.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he did not like to contradict the Prime Minister on a question of the traditions of the House; but this was not a purely formal stage. It was a novel proceeding, as it was the first time that such a Bill had been introduced into the House. It was a practical admission that they were borrowing so much money that they could not trust to the ordinary sources. That in itself was, surely, of sufficient importance to be considered very seriously. He, therefore, submitted that the matter should not be taken at that hour of the morning. The Resolution was of far-reaching importance, the Cunard Agreement marked a departure in the policy of this country, and the Anglo-French Agreement was also of great importance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not propose to take the Anglo-French Agreement that night.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was some concession. Why should they not confine themselves to the Shop Hours Bill? They were anxious to assist the Government in getting that Bill through. It was preposterous to start such a Motion at one o'clock in the morning. The next thing the Government would do would be to introduce the Budget at three o'clock. [AN HON. MEMBER: Oh.] The hon. Member had never prolonged discussion, because he had never taken an articulate part in the proceedings. He maintained that highly contentious business such as that now proposed should not be taken at such an hour. To proceed with it would be a perfect farce.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said he thought the Prime Minister had not met the Motion of his right hon. friend as fairly as he might. No doubt this was an important stage which ought to be fairly and fully discussed. The nearest analogy to the Motion was the Naval Works Bill and the Military Works Bill, on which a full statement had always been made on their introduction. Even the Prime Minister would not say that the Report stage would be taken at a reasonable hour. This was a Bill of a very far-reaching character; and it would add £10,000,000 to the floating debt. One of the first duties they were constantly urging on the Government was to decrease the floating debt; and yet they were asked at that hour of the morning, without any adequate explanation, to increase it by £10,000,000. He thought his right hon. friend was amply justified in making his Motion. In the interest of decency of debate they ought to have a better opportunity of discussing the matter.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he did not think that the Prime Minister understood the importance of the proposal. The Bill would facilitate what economists had been declaiming against for years. Yet at this period of the session the Government had introduced a Bill to facilitate a practice which had been generally condemned. He hoped the Prime Minister would proceed instead with the Shop Hours Bill.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that his right hon. friend was perfectly justified in his Motion. The fact that the Prime Minister had dropped the fourth Order made the matter somewhat more satisfactory; but he submitted that it would be a great pity if after a long, friendly, and good-tempered discussion on the War Office Vote, they should now, through a little hot-headedness, descend to an ill-tempered discussion, and have to struggle through one of those prolonged sittings which were so injurious to the health of Members and detrimental, not only to public business, but to the reputation of the House. He would urge the right hon. Gentleman to drop Order No. 3 as well as Order No. 4. In any event this Resolution would have to be discussed, and discussed in detail. This Resolution was not formal, as the right hon. Gentleman appeared to imagine; and even if it had been customary in ordinary circumstances to assent to such Resolutions without lengthy discussion he submitted that that could not occur in view of the unusual financial circumstances in which they found themselves. It was the first time in twenty years that they had been called upon to make such a departure, and to issue new Exchequer bonds at a time when the conditions of credit were not at all favourable. The right hon. Gentleman, in asking the Committee to assent to this Resolution, was asking them to assent to something they could not apprehend. The Chancellor of the Exchequer read out a number of figures very rapidly; and it was impossible to grasp their import. If the right hon. Gentleman would agree to report Progress now, they would be able to see the figures in the morning, and be in a position to give an intelligible decision upon them. He would call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that they were now beginning a regular course of late sittings. His right hon. friend did not propose that the Government should not proceed further; and he indicated the Shop Hours Bill. Was it not possible for the Prime Minister to make some response to his right hon. friend which might avoid a very unpleasant result? Having regard to the financial situation, those who deeply regretted the great increase of expenditure were bound to challenge all financial business in a manner that had not been customary of recent years, and if a reason was to be looked for it might be found in the necessity for the introduction of such a measure as that now under discussion.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Windbag!

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that for the second time an offensive expression had been used across the floor of the House. No notice was taken of the first, but he now desired to ask if it was in order for the hon. Member for Newcastle to call his hon. friend a "windbag." [MINISTERIAL laughter.] Such gross breaches of order might be a subject for merriment to hon. Members opposite, but he submitted that they were out of order, and that the hon. Member for Newcastle ought to be called upon to withdraw the expression.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the expression "windbag" is offensive, and I trust the hon. Member will withdraw it

At the same time, I hope the hon. Member for Oldham will say nothing likely to provoke such expressions.

Mr. RENWICK: Perhaps it was a little strong language. [OPPOSITION cries of "Withdraw."] I withdraw it.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL: I was not aware, Sir, that I had said anything of a provocative character.

***The CHAIRMAN**: The hon. Member has addressed the Committee four times in the space of two or three hours, and therefore he must not be too particular if observations are made indicating that the patience of the Committee is severely tried. I have done my best to get a fair hearing for him, but I hope he will not try the patience of the Committee too far.

Mr. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) asked whether there was any rule as to the number of times a Member might speak in Committee.

***The CHAIRMAN**: There is no rule, but if a Member addresses the Committee very frequently and repeats over and over again the same observations he must not be surprised if he is met with some cries of impatience.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Have you called my hon. friend to order for repeating himself?

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he gathered the Chairman's criticism was directed to the quantity of his utterances, and not to the quality. He could not have been repeating his arguments for then the Chair would have called him to order. With great respect he submitted that the quantity of his remarks was a matter for the rules of the House, and not for the Chair. Desiring, however, to show respect not merely to the Chair but to its occupant, he would conclude his remarks by accepting the withdrawal of the hon. Member for Newcastle, although he thought the word was one against which they were bound to protest.

Sir EDWARD GREY was surprised at the heat generated on the other side of the House. The Motion to report Progress had been supported in a most conciliatory spirit, and had been interpreted by his hon. friends in an even more definitely conciliatory form than as originally moved. A positive invitation had been given to the Government to proceed with the Shop Hours Bill, and he hoped the Prime Minister would take note of the fact. The right hon. Gentleman in meeting the Motion might have been a little less curt. ["Oh."] He did not say nor did he mean "discourteous"; he said "curt." The Prime Minister had said this was a purely formal stage of the two Orders he proposed to deal with; but the contention of the Opposition was that very important matters were involved which required fuller consideration than could be given at two o'clock in the morning. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman might have said that as the present was a formal stage he would bring forward, at any rate, one of the subsequent stages of each Bill at an hour before midnight when it could be properly and adequately discussed. If the right hon. Gentleman would give a definite promise to that effect he would be prepared, personally, to withdraw the Motion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was very sorry that the right hon. Baronet should have thought that his exposition was so brief. He thought it would need a great straining of language to show that any principle of importance was raised by either of these Bills. The question was not whether the Committee would add to our debt. These matters had reference to obligations which the country had entered into and the repudiation of which would not be conducive to economy. Then he was told there was the Savings Bank question, but he submitted that that did not come up on this Bill legitimately. What they had to deal with in this Bill was one simple proposition, carrying out obligations entered into by this House deliberately, and therefore there was no alternative but to take the course which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken. He did not think honestly that that could be described as a proposition which required a long debate. Then the Cunard Agreement was an obligation distinctly entered into by the House of Commons by Resolution which was not taken after twelve o'clock, but which he quite admitted might have been taken at an earlier hour to-day. How could it be said that in regard to either of these money Resolutions the Government in the smallest degree had abused the legitimate claims which they had upon the time of the House. He hoped the hon. Baronet would agree with him when he said that they had done their best to meet the wishes of hon. Members opposite.

Sir EDWARD GREY said he asked the right hon. Gentleman about affording an opportunity upon a subsequent stage of these two measures.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not see how such an undertaking could be given.

Sir EDWARD GREY said that if every stage was to be regarded as being just as formal as this he must persist in his Motion. But if the Prime Minister would undertake that one of the subsequent stages in each case should be brought on at an hour when it could be discussed, he was prepared to withdraw his Motion.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer knew very well what was going on in the City, and he might inform the Prime Minister that it was most important if anything was done to increase this debt. It was a very important and a thoroughly controversial measure. Under these circumstances he did think they were justified in asking that they should have a discussion upon one stage taken at some reasonable hour. They were told earlier in the session that they were to have a day set apart for discussion upon the Cunard Agreement. They could not call what took place a discussion when the matter was brought on after midnight. They were quite willing to allow this measure to go through if the Prime Minister would give them one single stage upon which they could discuss the matter. In regard to the expenditure upon the Army and Navy and upon Uganda they had again and again asked to be allowed to discuss those questions, but now at the end of the session, when the Twelve O'clock Rule had been suspended, the Government were forcing all those questions upon them, when they knew very well that there could not be that important discussion which was necessary, and they called that keeping their pledges! Pledges had been given in regard to this particular Resolution, and this Cunard Agreement was regarded as a most important matter in the City. They were not seeking in any way to obstruct the business. Surely when they were simply asking for one single day to discuss a stage of this subject they were not asking too much. His contention was that Bills of this kind ought to be completely discussed at least once. This was all the more urgent because the Chancellor of the Exchequer had sprung upon them a change in regard to this Bill.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman really could not meet with any agreement on this side of the House. If he had followed the history of the question he would know that a day had been promised for the discussion of the Agreement. What actually took place last session was that the discussion of the Agreement was deferred over and over again, and finally on the 12th of August there was an extremely brief discussion in a very empty House. The matter could not be dealt with then, and the House had had no real opportunity of discussing it. It was hardly fair to have it rushed through in this way. If the right hon. Gentleman persisted in the proposal it would mean that arrangements would be made by Departments, and the House of Commons would lose all control. He hoped the Prime Minister would consider the proposal made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick, namely, to take a formal stage to-night, and the later stages at a time when hon. Members could have a daylight discussion on the subject.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he wished to support what had fallen from his hon. friend. The way the House was treated in the matter of the Cunard Agreement was really a scandal. The promise of a day was given last session, and that promise had not been redeemed.

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 127; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 296.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F. Sheffield, Brightside)
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H.E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cullinan, J.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Allice, Capt E C(S. Andrw's Bghs
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lyell, Charles Henry
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 53; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 297.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cullinan, J.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC (S. Andrw's Bghs
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lyell, Charles Henry
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, SW.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S,
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriess
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J. (Walthmstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Noes, Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not give the Committee any adequate explanation of the Bill. It was a Bill of the most important and far-reaching character. It amended seven Acts of Parliament, and made other alterations not alluded to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He gathered that the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to provide money by setting up terminable annuities to be repaid in about thirty years. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was in difficulties, and could not any longer get money from the National Debt Commissioners for these particular purposes. As he understood it, the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to substitute for the existing form of terminable annuities, set up under the various Acts concerned, the issue of Treasury Bonds. He did not tell the Committee if there was any limit to these bonds or what the duration of them would be; and he said absolutely nothing as to whether a sinking fund would be established.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that with regard to the rate of the exact currency of the bonds he must be guided by the circumstances of the time at which they were issued. Provision would be made by the Treasury for the discharge of the loan out of sums to be annually provided by Parliament within a period not exceeding the period fixed by the Act which authorised the borrowing.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked if the new bonds would be in the same position as the existing Exchequer Bonds.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said they would be in the same position except as regarded a special provision for a sinking fund.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that the right hon. Gentleman proposed to raise £9,250,000, and set up a security of a much more permanent character than that which now existed. At present there was a floating debt of between £49,000,000 and £50,000,000 outstanding. The policy down to 1899 was to reduce that debt as far as possible; and great progress in that direction was made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol. Since then £13,000,000 of Treasury Bills and £20,000,000 of Treasury Bonds had been issued as the result of the war; and now the Chancellor of the Exchequer was proposing a very considerable addition to this particular form of debt. He thought the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was evidence of the financial embarrassment in which the recent expenditure of the Government had involved the country. They were piling up expenditure year after year, and were endeavouring to meet it by borrowing money under various Acts of Parliament. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was always fond of pointing to his hon. friend the Member for Dundee and saying that it was he who began the Naval Works Acts. He would not defend his hon. friend beyond saying that the first Naval Works Act was an Act for a special purpose. The present Government, however, turned it into a system; and they could not be altogether disappointed when they found an important part of that system breaking down. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to give the Committee an assurance that there would be no further extension of this pernicious and wasteful system.

Mr. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.) said that there was one statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer which ought not to be allowed to pass without criticism, and that was that no new principle was involved in this matter, because the Committee were already committed to the expenditure which was now proposed. It seemed to him to be an analogous case to that of a small boy who stole apples, his defence being that the apples were eaten, and that, therefore, all moral delinquency had ceased. He hoped some information would be given on the matter.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that up to the present this money was always raised by terminable annuities which provided their own sinking fund. As far as he understood the matter, the money would be provided for the extinction of this debt year by year. That was not quite the same thing as a terminable annuity.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the charge appeared in the Votes now, and would appear in the Votes in the future.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said there was one objection to that course, and that was that a future Chancellor of the Exchequer might not carry out the course adopted by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. It would have been better if there were terminable annuities. Another objection was the rate of interest they would have to pay. Three and a-half per cent. would have to be paid for this money. Bad as was the credit of the Government—and as long as these expedients were adopted it was not likely to improve—they could get the money at 3 per cent., instead of 3½ per cent., by an issue of Consols. The so-called floating debt was becoming practically permanent, and seeing that there was no prospect of the money being paid off, that extra ½ per cent. was a serious matter. A further issue of Consols would have a less detrimental effect upon prices than subterfuges of this kind. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give some indication of the amount to be raised by terminable annuities it would remove some of the objection entertained to this Resolution.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN was understood to say that the sum depended upon the amount deposited in the savings bank this year, but he should think it would be about £3,000,000.

MR. RUNCIMAN said the debate had been justified by the information which he derived. It now appeared that £6,500,000 and not £9,500,000 was raised by Exchequer bonds, and £3,000,000 by terminable annuities. The Committee was entitled to have some estimate of the additional burden that was to be laid upon the country. How were the annuities which appeared on the Votes each year to be applied? Further, how much was to be placed on the Estimates against this £9,500,000? Would it be 4 per cent. to cover interest and some repayment of capital, or what would it be? He protested against the Committee being asked at two o'clock in the morning in the month of August to endorse a huge loan of this description. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would have done better to have stated, when he dealt with the general financial situation of the country, that he was likely to be in these straits; the House would then have been better able to estimate the real financial position. The ordinary means of providing for works accounts were entirely exhausted. By placing these bonds upon the market the right hon. Gentleman would not only have to pay 3½ per cent. interest, an amount unprecedented in the last fifty years, but he would be actually depressing his own stock.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) submitted that this expenditure had been sanctioned on the clear understanding that the money would be provided for by terminable annuities. He remembered the Chancellor of the Exchequer saying that they could not issue terminable annuities beyond a certain amount, because the quantity taken up by the public was strictly a limited question. The Government had now reached that limited amount. In one of the largest municipalities in Great Britain the chief magistrate told him that their indebtedness cost them less than 3 per cent. Why should the British Empire be unable to borrow at a worse rate of interest than a municipality? Because the Government did not understand finance. The only road to success in finance was economy. It would now go forth to the City of London that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could no longer issue terminable annuities, and that he was obliged to issue Exchequer Bonds at 3½ per cent. to be repaid from time to time. He thought they were entitled to ask what time, and they ought to know also how much would be set aside for this purpose in the Budget next year.

*__MR. HERBERT SAMUEL__ (Yorkshire, Cleveland) asked why it was necessary to ask for money for capital expenditure in regard to the Uganda Railway, seeing that the railway had been completed and no further capital expenditure ought consequently to be required. The line had been quite completed and the viaducts finished, the committee formed to construct the railway had been dissolved, and the railway had been handed over to the British East Africa Protectorate. Under these circumstances they ought to have some information why the House was still asked to vote £219,000 for this purpose which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to go into the market to borrow.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the sum mentioned remained over for payment this year.

Mr. TOULMIN (Lancashire, Bury) asked if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made any estimate of the cost of raising this sum of money in this way. He thought some reasons ought to be given why Exchequer Bonds had been chosen. He did not know whether it was preferable to issue for a long or a short period on such an occasion as this, but there was the great disadvantage that when they matured they would have to be renewed, and each time they had to be renewed fresh charges were incurred. The advantage of terminable annuities is that their operation is regular, and their effect on the market can easily be ascertained and provided for. The real reason why the Chancellor of the Exchequer has had to take this step is that he has been borrowing as much as he has been paying off. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer had provided more money for the reduction of the National Debt, the National Debt Commissioners would have had more money in hand, and this recourse to Exchequer bonds would not have taken place to so great an extent. He should like to know whether the extra cost involved in raising this money would be charged against the naval and military services. Would the annual Estimates be increased by that extra amount? Would the annual payments entirely extinguish the Exchequer Bonds as would have been done in the case of terminable annuities?

Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) rose to continue the discussion.

Mr CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 122; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 298.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.(Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John.
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Fergusson, RtHn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J.(Londonderry,South
Green,Walford D.(Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George

Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, VincentP.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lyell, Charles Henry
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M‘Arthur.

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 123; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 299.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.(Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J.(Londonderry,South
Green,Walford D.(Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.)
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon M.W.(Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Flavin. Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Buchanan.

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sums which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report this Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 123; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 300.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds'
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster Philip S. (Warwick S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, Jas. (Staffords. N. W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell Rt Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n

Maxwell W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. H. A. Graham(Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W.(Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W.(Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Soares and Mr. Herbert Roberts.

Resolution to be reported this day.

CUNARD AGREEMENT [MONEY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) in moving this Resolution, said that in Clause 10 of the agreement the Government undertook to provide a loan for the building of two ships named in the agreement. The Government were bound to advance this loan to the company in order that the vessels specified in the agreement might be completed. It was proposed to raise the money by means of Exchequer Bonds.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding in the whole £2,600,000, as are required for making the Advances to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited) under an Agreement with that Company, dated 30th July, 1903, and approved by the House of Commons 12th August, 1903, to authorise the Treasury to borrow money, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for the issue of such sums or the repayment thereof, the principal of and interest on such bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make other provisions relating to the said agreement."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Mr. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said it was impossible to discuss the matter at that late hour. He should like to give the Prime Minister an opportunity of fulfilling his pledge that a full opportunity would be given for the discussion of this Motion. Therefore he would move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. William Jones.*)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought that the hon. Member's proposal was unreasonable. There was nothing to discuss except a matter which, if they were treating it individually, they would think the plain simple duty of honest men who had entered into an agreement. He did not see why the House of Commons should be less honest than the Members who composed it. He suggested that it really required no debate, and it was irrespective of the hour of the day whether they should or should not carry out their plain duty.

Sir EDWARD GREY said he would remind the Prime Minister that on 12th May of this year, in reply to the hon. Member for King's Lynn, he stated that he could not promise a day for the discussion of the Cunard agreement before the Whitsuntide holidays. When the Prime Minister made an answer of that kind, surely in the common understanding of what passed across the floor of the House between the Leader of the House and the House of Commons as a House, it did lead the House justifiably to contemplate that some better time would be given before the close of the session than half-past three o'clock in the morning. The Colonial Secretary demurred to that?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I demurred to it.

Sir EDWARD GREY thought the Prime Minister was doing what he thought he might fairly say was a very unusual thing—putting a narrow, legal, and technical interpretation upon the language he had quoted. In future they were to understand that whenever the right hon. Gentleman said he could not promise a day before the Whitsuntide holidays, that was to be interpreted that probably no time would be given.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR hoped the right hon. Baronet, when he used that form of language again, would think in future, as he hoped the right hon. Baronet thought in the past, that he meant exactly what he said. No Leader of the House could forecast the whole business of the session or tell what course the Opposition would take in furthering or in not furthering the Government business, and so difficult was it to arrange business and so careful was every Leader of the House who knew his trade not to give pledges that he could not fulfil, that pledges must be interpreted literally in the sense in which they were given.

Sir EDWARD GREY said that that was to say the words must be interpreted in the narrowest possible sense, and that when the Prime Minister said that he could not promise a day before the Whitsuntide holidays, they were to take it that no reasonable time would be given at all before the end of the session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not the conclusion to be drawn from what I said. I could not promise a day before the Whitsuntide holidays, and by implication I could make no promise one way or the other with regard to the rest of the session.

Sir EDWARD GREY said all he submitted was that Members who were interested in this discussion, and who in May last were displaying a desire to have a discussion on this subject, and got from the Prime Minister the answer he then gave, were entitled at least to be disappointed and to express their disappointment now when they found they had no opportunity at all. The Prime Minister was not treating the House fairly in this matter. The Opposition had not been unreasonable. The first Motion to report Progress was not intended to stop business; it was intended to effect some discrimination in the business later and was accompanied by an offer to take other business. The Prime Minister said he proposed to take Orders 1 and 2 on the ground that they were purely formal stages, and upon that he (the speaker) offered to withdraw his Motion and to agree to those stages being taken as formal, provided an undertaking was given that on a subsequent stage of each Bill discussion should be admitted. He fully expected the Prime Minister to agree to it, but when he asked directly whether such an opportunity would be afforded he was met by a blank negative. That was why he thought the right hon. Gentleman was not treating the House fairly. To ask the Committee to pass two measures on the ground that they were formal stages, and that there would be subsequent opportunities for discussion, was to allow the Committee to suppose that those opportunities would come at a time when they might be availed of. He was glad the discussion on the Motion went on, because if it had stopped after the Prime Minister's statement, and it had been found afterwards that the subsequent stages were to be equally formal and brought on when discussion was equally impossible, there would have been a misunderstanding between the right hon. Gentleman and the House more unpleasant than anything which had occurred in Parliament within his memory. He had been a Member of the House for a good many years, and he had seen several Leaders of the House, but he had never seen the House so treated, and nothing had occurred in his memory to leave behind it so unpleasant a feeling. And what led up to it? There had been no waste of time previous to the Motion to report Progress. It was true he had spoken on the Imperial Defence question longer than he had intended, and he was sorry he had done so, but it was not his intention to deal with anything but the merits of the question. The Motion to reduce the Vote on a comparatively small but not altogether unimportant point was not followed by a long debate, and in the division many of the Opposition voted with the Government. The whole discussion was as friendly as could be wished. Then came what he had described to the Committee, and when they finally proceeded to the discussion the closure was applied at a time when debate had certainly not lost interest and when more than one important question had been raised but no answer given. What had happened would leave the feeling that the Government were not making a fair use of the power at their disposal; it would deepen the feeling which had began to take possession of many Members, that discussion in the present House of Commons was a farce, because the Government treated the House with a want of consideration which had never been exampled, at any rate in his memory, by any previous Government or any previous Leader of the House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said there was no man in the House with whom he was less desirous of coming into conflict than the right hon. Baronet, for whom he had the sincerest regard. When the right hon. Baronet made an attack upon him he was sure he did not simulate a passion which he did not feel, which he should have suspected in the case of a person for whom he had less respect, but certainly the grounds for such indignation were the flimsiest he could imagine. It was extremely probable that the right hon. Baronet would one day stand where he (the speaker) now stood as Leader of the House, and then when he had to give answers dealing with the time of the House he would be uncommonly surprised if he was told that when he said a day could not be given before a particular date it meant that a day was to be given after that date.

Sir EDWARD GREY: We have not asked for a whole day.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was trying to reply to the personal attack upon himself. If he said that a day could not be given before Whitsuntide it could never mean that a day should necessarily be given after Whitsuntide He could not agree with the right hon. Baronet's account of what had passed. He had never heard a more profitable discussion than that which took place up to quarter to twelve, but after that the debate degenerated and lost caste. The House that afternoon, by a large majority, in consideration of the amount of business yet to be transacted, had given the Government power to proceed with their Bills after twelve o'clock; and the Government had cut down their demand upon the House to the passing of two Resolutions of a formal character. If any one had cause of complaint it was the Government, who were suffering from the action of the Party opposite, and all because they had asked for a small instalment of the business of the nation which was necessary to carry out the honourable obligations of the House.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the right hon. Gentleman had referred to the old traditions of the House and had stated that they used to sit late. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the

House also used to meet earlier, and in the old days there was no closure and no guillotine Resolutions, but now they had all sorts of methods of preventing discussion, and they had resorted to other methods after the new-fangled notions were introduced more or less by the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman had treated this purely as a formal stage to carry out what he had called honourable obligations. It was quite true that this contract was ratified by the House, but there were two important considerations to be taken into account. The Prime Minister had overlooked the method by which the money was to be raised. It was going to be raised by Exchequer bonds, and that was a very serious departure, which would affect very much the credit of the Government. Surely that was a question which ought to be discussed very fully. An important question of public policy was involved. Supposing the House of Commons came to the conclusion that it was not desirable to carry out this agreement for reasons of public policy; circumstances might arise under which it might be better to buy up the contract although it had been signed. It was a question now of the character of the agreement, and whether it was desirable now to proceed with it. With regard to the opportunity promised for discussing this agreement, he thought that nine out of every ten Members who heard the speech of the Prime Minister upon that question would have come to the conclusion that he promised to give a day after Whitsuntide if he proceeded with the matter. That was really a pledge that he would give a day to discuss this question. The right hon. Gentleman asked how was he to know what course the Opposition would take? What course could they take in view of the facts and the events of the last few months? They had in power a Government which had absolutely forfeited the confidence of the country and they were proceeding with business which they had no mandate to proceed with. It was their first duty to resist any proposal brought in by the Government if they did not approve of it. He asked the right hon. Gentleman what he would have done if he had been Leader of the Opposition? He ventured to say that the opposition the right hon. Gentleman would have given to the measures of a Liberal Government would have been of a more fierce and persistent character than any which he himself had had to encounter. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had any reason to complain of the Opposition with which he had been faced. He thought the Government had been treated too leniently and that they had no right to complain of the treatment they had received at the hands of the opposition. Under these circumstances, the right hon. Gentleman must have known the course which the Opposition would take. His right hon. friend had made a perfectly fair suggestion in regard to the Cunard agreement. What about Friday? Why did the Prime Minister not put it down as the first Order on Friday and go on with the Parsons Bill afterwards? The House of Commons was asked to discuss the Cunard agreement at this hour in the morning (four o'clock).

An HON. MEMBER sitting on the back Bench on the Ministerial side of the House interjected a remark which was not heard in the Gallery. The remark was followed by a cry of "Sit down," to which another Member replied "Go to bed."

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): I rise, Sir, to order I venture to say that an hon. Gentleman made an interjection in the debate which is calculated to be deliberately insulting to my hon. friend. I appeal to you, Sir, to use the authority of the Chair to control and restrain him.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I did not catch the observation. I wish it were in my power to control and restrain all the people in this House who make insulting observations. I am quite sure the hon. Gentleman will withdraw the remark if it was offensive.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not complain. He could perfectly see that the hon. Member was in a condition of excitement and was not responsible. When interrupted he was supporting the reasonable suggestion that an opportunity for discussing this matter should be given on Friday in daylight. Why should the Prime Minister give all the best time to that very spiteful little Bill which he was going to bring forward on Friday? Why did he not give the House opportunities for discussing the real business of the country? After all this was the real business of the country, because it involved matters in relation to the defence and the commerce of the country. The Cunard agreement ought to be brought forward at a time when they would have a fair opportunity for scrutinising it. There was the whole of next week when that could be done, but the Prime Minister was giving no opportunity for debating the matter at all. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would not now promise to give an opportunity for discussion next Friday, making this matter the First Order of the day? [Cries of "No."] He thought it was a perfectly reasonable offer. The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well what would happen if he did not agree to this. Was not this the sort of thing that would happen every night unless the Prime Minister gave them an opportunity for discussing the agreement? He was not speaking in any spirit of defiance. He was speaking with some experience of what happened in the House when the right hon. Gentleman and his friends were in Opposition. He remembered how they used to keep hon. Members up, moving Motions for the adjournment of the House and to report Progress, because, as they thought, the Front Opposition Bench had refused reasonable requests from the then Opposition. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was serving the best interests of the House of Commons by the course he was now taking. After all, Members of the Opposition were not responsible for these things being thrown to the fag end of the session. The Licensing Bill was guillotined and forced through the House in five or six days, and the present state of business was not due to the measures of the session having been over-debated. They had not been debated at all practically. The state of business was due to something else. The right hon. Gentleman had his difficulties no doubt, but he had managed to get out of them very well up to the present. The management of the business of the House was not in the hands of the Opposition, and, therefore, if important questions were driven to the fag end of the session the Opposition were not responsible. Was it fair that they should be compelled to discuss great financial problems involving a complete departure from precedent and affecting the defence and commerce of the country at this hour?

Mr. RUNCIMAN pressed the Prime Minister for an answer to the question put by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick. Would the Prime Minister treat as formal the stage of the Cunard agreement which he proposed to take now, and give an opportunity on a later stage for discussing the matter?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not mean that this question was not formal.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said that there could be no reasonable discussion of this question at four o'clock in the morning. If the right hon. Gentleman was going to carry on this principle through all stages of the Bill they ought not to discuss the Bill at all. When the right hon. Gentleman was in Opposition he would not have agreed to such a procedure as he was now forcing on the Committee. Were they not to discuss the *status* of these vessels in view of events now passing in the Far East? The idea was preposterous. The truth was that the Prime Minister did not mean to give any day for discussing this Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that he meant what he said. He could not say whether there would be any discussion at all.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said that as to the question put by the hon. Member for King's Lynn there was no mention of Whitsuntide. It was a perfectly gratuitous interpolation on the part of the Prime Minister to say that no day would be given before Whitsuntide. He was quite sure that what was wanted was that a clear day should be given, or even half a day, before the end of the session, in order to enable those who had such strong views in regard to this agreement to give expression to them. The right hon. Gentleman must know that a discussion after twelve o'clock would be absolutely futile. There would not be more than 110 Members in the precincts of the House, and such a discussion would be perfunctory in the last degree.

The action of the Prime Minister in suggesting that the Committee could discuss this important question at a quarter past four in the morning was nothing more nor less than flouting the House of Commons.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that his hon. friend had drawn attention to the fact that there had been an honourable engagement to give a day to the discussion of this question, and which the Government was bound to keep. But, after all, it rested with the House or the Committee to approve or reject such an engagement. He ventured to point out to the Prime Minister whether they were not getting into rather an unsatisfactory and difficult situation. If the Prime Minister wanted to get his business through he ought to act in a more conciliatory manner. If the right hon. Gentleman adopted a course of give-and-take, and made a fair bargain with hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House, this struggle might be altogether avoided. All parts of the House were interested in pledges given being carried out. He did not suggest that the Prime Minister had broken a promise, but there was a general impression that a proper opportunity would be given for the discussion of this question. And why not? It was a very important question, and had acquired a new importance in consequence of the Morgan combine. It was a proper thing that the Committee should discuss it; and he submitted that it was a reasonable interpretation of the right hon. Gentleman's statement that the Committee would be given an opportunity for discussion. That impression might be erroneous; but was the right hon. Gentleman willing to profit by a false impression?

Mr. A. J. **Balfour** rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 123 Noes, 53. (Division List No. 301.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick. S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon J. (Londonderry, South
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col Hon Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H.E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu,. G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk

Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lyell, Charles Henry
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 52; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 302.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank. Master of
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vidcent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lyell, Charles Henry
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Ed. T. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Mancr'
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. H. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

*MR. RUNCIMAN said that the Cunard Company, if it went into the market to obtain money in the usual way, would certainly have to pay over 4 per cent., so that the Government were advancing money to the company at $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. less than the market considered safe. Beyond that, the Government paid a subsidy of £150,000 with respect to two steamships. The Cunard Company would repay £130,000 of the loan and £35,000 in interest. So that the company would pay £15,000 per annum to the Government, and would be insuring for themselves, at the end of twenty years, the entire ownership of those two vessels which the Government were financing at the startlingly low rate of $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. From the present state of the money market he calculated that it would cost the Government something like $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to float their Exchequer bonds, so that in that transaction alone there would be a dead loss to the Government of $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. on the loan of £2,500,000. That was a thoroughly bad business transaction. The whole genesis of this transaction grew out of Admiralty requirements and the state of panic which the Government did a great deal to foster at the time of the formation of the Morgan Combine. The Secretary to the Admiralty defended the proposal by saying that one of its main objects was to allay the panic which had somehow captured the British people. If the Government had known anything about shipping they would have known that the Morgan Combine, given its inception, was doomed to failure. The whole control had now practically drifted back to Liverpool under, he believed, Mr. Ismay. It was stated that these vessels were not to perform the ordinary duties of cruisers; it was therefore to be assumed that they were to act as scouts or despatch vessels. But how could so enormous an increase of the nation's indebtedness be justified merely for the purpose of securing two scouts or two despatch vessels? Moreover, if it was necessary to embark on this undertaking, why did the Government at the same time withdraw from similar undertakings with regard to other companies? It was material to the question to consider the vessels in respect of which this agreement was entered into—the gross registered tonnage and the value at which the Government would be bound to purchase the vessels if in time of war they considered it necessary to do so. The "Lucania" and the "Campania" were advancing rapidly in age; their tonnage was 12,900, and under this agreement the Government would be compelled to purchase those vessels at £350,000, or £28 per gross registered ton. The whole tonnage of the fleet from top to bottom was 110,000, and the sum at which the Government would be compelled to purchase was £1,990,000. The total market value of the shares of this company when the agreement was drawn up was £1,200,000, and since that time the Government had undertaken to purchase a portion of the property represented by those shares for £1,990,000. That was one of the reasons why they found their credit running out and why they had to resort to all sorts of schemes in order to raise the wind. The Cunard Company was under an obligation to allow their boats out on hire, if necessary, at a certain rate, and what was that rate? If the speed was above twenty-two knots the charge was 30s. per gross registered ton. There was no shipowner in the country who was not prepared to allow his vessels out on hire for ever at that price. Recently they had had a chance of testing these figures and he had found that out of the whole list of 117 vessels of a fairly fast speed only a few received over 20s. per gross registered ton. What did the "Aurania," which was just under seventeen knots, receive? The agreement stated that if she steamed seventeen knots she would get 20s.

*The SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said these terms were in existence at the time under the old agreement which had been embodied in this agreement. He thought the hon. Gentleman opposite was a business man and he ought to know that when they made terms for compulsory hire they were higher than when they were made in the open market.

*Mr. RUNCIMAN said this company undertook to place their fleet at the disposal of the Government upon those terms. Supposing the Admiralty went into the market at the beginning of the next war. If they were able to hire vessels at anything under these rates, did the hon. Gentleman mean to say that the Cunard Company could not come down and insist upon the Government taking some of their vessels? Was the hon. Member not aware that by this agreement the Government practically settled the price?

*Mr. PRETYMAN said the hon. Member had stated that the "Aurania" was obtained at a much less rate.

*Mr. RUNCIMAN said he could not understand why the "Aurania" was chartered at 16s. per gross registered ton at a time when she was entitled to 17s. 6d. according to the agreement.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that the Cunard Company had to take at that time, and they would have to take in future, whatever they could obtain in the ordinary market in competition with other companies, and that was what was obtained for the "Aurania." The Cunard Company were bound by this agreement to let the ships to the Admiralty at that rate, but the Admiralty were not bound to take them at that rate. This was binding on the company but not on the Admiralty.

*Mr. RUNCIMAN said that he quite understood the position indicated by the hon. Gentleman, but that did not at all meet the point. The agreement would give an enormously high profit to those engaged in this particular service. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would explain how far we could rely on the old figures incorporated in the new agreement. Perhaps he would further tell the Committee what was to be the exact standing of these vessels. Were they to be vessels like the Volunteer Fleet—of a semi-mercantile and semi-warlike character? If they were to be vessels similar to the Russian Volunteer Fleet what would happen if one of the new Cunarders happened to be at New York at the moment when we went to war with another Power? Of course, the House did not know at present the exact bearing on this scheme of the questions raised by the recent passage of the Volunteer Fleet through the Dardanelles, but he ventured to suggest that the complications which were arising with regard to that fleet would considerably handicap us with regard to the employment of these Cunard vessels if they happened to be outside our waters when hostilities broke out. The House ought to have an opportunity of discussing the whole of this question, not at 5 o'clock in the morning, when it was impossible to have a full discussion, and when a large number of hon. Members were prevented from being there.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said his hon. friend stated a little earlier that it was not possible to have an effective discussion of the subject at this hour of the morning. He thought the Committee would be generally of opinion that the hon. Gentleman had erred on the side of modesty, for he had just delivered a comprehensive and vigorous speech, in which he had shown a profound knowledge of the whole of this complicated subject. He ventured to say that a more lucid statement had rarely been heard, and it argued not less for his hon. friend's vigour than his intellectual strength that he had been able to deliver such a speech. His hon. friend had laid before the House the details of this extraordinary agreement. It was quite clear that for an annual payment during twenty years of £15,000 the Cunard Company would ultimately become the possessors of these two great ships of the value of £2,600,000. The value of the company's fleet in being was only estimated by them at a sum of £2,000,000. This wonderful argument was due to the President of the Board of Trade, who was thrown into a state of panic by the Morgan combination.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) appealed to the Chairman for a ruling as to whether the agreement or the raising of the money was the proper subject for discussion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is the means of raising the money, but in discussing the means of raising the money it would be in order for the hon. Member to discuss the agreement.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he would endeavour not to trespass long upon the indulgence and attention of the Committee. He should like to say that this shipping agreement was the twin brother of the Sugar Bounty Convention.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. Gentleman can discuss the Sugar Bounty Convention.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he did not mean to do more than mention it. This agreement and the Sugar Bounty Convention were the product of the right hon. Gentleman's brain at the time when all those new ideas of taxation were abroad. Everybody knew that the great steel combination had broken down and that the great shipping combine had also broken down, and was the laughing-stock of everybody except the shareholders. He did not pretend that this question should be settled on financial or even purely economic grounds. He recognised the fact that the blue-ribbon of the Atlantic was a thing that they ought not to forget. It had its sentimental value apart from its practical value, which no politician who took a comprehensive view of the question could possibly ignore. Of course, the Admiralty had to consider the question from a naval and military point of view. The question of the value of cruisers and scouts was now being discussed, but why should the Admiralty have gone to a private company to solve the problem instead of solving it for themselves? He admitted that to have steamers running at 24½ knots an hour would enable us to send troops on an emergency to some critical point; but he thought that, on reflection, it would be found that we had made an extremely bad bargain, no matter with however laudable an object. He trusted that when the Committee stage was reached there would be full discussion as to whether we had or had not made bad terms with the Cunard Company. He held that numerous facts, which were accumulating, showed that when a Government interfered in the affairs of trade they frequently committed blunders.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he regretted the somewhat unreasonable and unconciliatory attitude which had been shown by the Prime Minister. He anticipated that after what had taken place that night there would be many other nights like it. He contemplated going away at the end of this week and leaving others to take up the duty of denouncing the Government and all their works. The junior Member for Oldham must then represent the Liberal Party in the House. He had wanted to discuss the question of Uganda, but the Prime Minister got up and moved the closure. As to this Cunard agreement, they knew that it had been rushed through the House on 12th August last year, when there was no possibility of discussion, and when there were only about eight Members in the House when the division was challenged. The Prime Minister had made a most solemn engagement that the matter would be properly discussed. A more foolish and silly arrangement than that which was now under discussion had never been entered upon. He regarded it as most unfair to other shipowners. They were giving large sums of money to this company to build ships which would be employed in their own trade, when there was no war, and when the probability was that the country would not be at war with any modern Power. The company would be able to charge smaller rates than other companies, and that would be unfair. He denied that this was a good speculation. The representative of the Navy had not explained what advantage would be derived from these ships, and whether it would not have been better to have built ships of their own. He hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would give an explanation. At present there was some difficulty with Russia owing to the action of the volunteer fleet in the Red Sea; and complications of a similar character might arise if they accepted these new ships as ships of war. In the event of war they might find themselves in conflict with France, Germany, or the United States. If the Secretary to the Treasury was able to show him what advantage would be derived from the ships he would be prepared to accept his view in preference to his own.

*MR. PRETYMAN said the gravamen of the attack upon this agreement was based upon two main grounds. One was that they were not getting value for their money and that the Cunard Company were getting very much the best of the bargain. In that connection he might be allowed to quote the words used in the debate on this subject last year by two Gentlemen on the Benches opposite. The hon. Member for Gloucester said—

> "He really did not think the Cunard Company had much to congratulate themselves upon. On the whole he was inclined to congratulate the Cunard Company more upon their courage in taking this contract than upon their luck in getting it."

The late Sir William Allen, who also had considerable knowledge of shipping matters, said—

> "He thought this was purely a matter of business, and that from the financial point of view the Government had got the best of the bargain."

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Experience has dissipated these predictions.

***Mr. PRETYMAN** said that at any rate they showed that this was an open question among authorities on the other side of the House, and the Committee should not accept it as proved that as a purely business matter the Cunard Company had got anything more than the value they were giving in return. The other point raised was that since the agreement was entered into in a moment of panic everything had changed. He entirely traversed that statement. Nothing had changed from the point of view of the Admiralty. The only thing that had changed was the case as regards the Atlantic combine. How far that change had been brought about by the very fact of this agreement being in existence he left the Committee to estimate. What the Admiralty were getting in return for this agreement were ships of a speed which would enable them to command the Atlantic. There were in existence at this moment four steamers

Mr. Pretyman.

of considerably greater speed than any steamer owned in this country. Bearing in mind recent events, the position of the food supplies of the country, and the fact that there were four steamers on the Atlantic which we could not catch, he thought it would be worth a large sum to obtain vessels which would secure to them——

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Are there no warships that could catch these steamers?

***Mr. PRETYMAN** said the range of a warship was measured in a totally different way to that of a merchant ship. Atlantic liners were constructed on very different lines to warships. The new Cunarders would be able, if necessary, to command the Atlantic. They would be able to catch any ship which could be placed on the Atlantic to injure their trade and stop their food supplies.

Sir EDWARD GREY: How soon will they be ready?

***Mr. PRETYMAN** said the orders for the ships had already been given by the Cunard Company. One was being built on the Tyne, the other on the Clyde. He believed something under two years was the term within which the ships would be completed.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that he did not think the hon. Gentleman was serious in one suggestion he made that this agreement contributed in any degree to smash up the international combine. The hon. Gentleman's idea was that this agreement had something to do with the failure of the Morgan combine.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said he did not suggest that.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the moment the panic was over people would not see anything in it. During the panic the idea was that the ships of this country would be taken over by other countries and that they would have no ships left. But the combine had turned out an absolute failure, and it was a serious warning to American shareholders not to attempt anything similar in the future. The combine had been a matter of the greatest possible security to this country, as it showed how utterly impossible it was to run anything of the kind except in a free-trade country such as this. He thought the agreement was one of the things which it would have been better had they not entered into. They had shown the peoples of the world that they could meet them on equal terms; but instead of doing that the Government got frightened, and the idea got abroad that this country was afraid and that it was conscious of a certain weakness in its position, whereas if they went on as before they would have been successful. They, however, got frightened by newspaper articles in the *Daily Mail* and other newspapers which helped to make the South African War; and the Government said that they would do something striking and dramatic. Governments which acted in that manner were generally the most feeble in the long run. It was Lord Salisbury's great strength that he never allowed himself to be affected by panic. If the Government had looked at all the conditions, they would have known that this country could have fought the great American combine and could have beaten it. They might have started a serious shipping war with America. A formidable agitation arose for the American Government to enter into similar arrangements, and if a Presidential election had been pending no one could tell what might have happened. Luckily there was a Government in power in America sufficiently strong to resist the pressure, otherwise we might have been involved in a serious shipping war with America. It was a question not of whether this was a good or bad bargain on its merits, but of whether it was desirable for the Government to enter into transactions of this character. He submitted that the agreement constituted a dangerous precedent which ought not to be followed.

Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) rose to speak.

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL, seated and covered, said this was the second time the hon. Member for Crewe had risen to address the Committee, and on both occasions he had been closured.

Mr. TOMKINSON explained that he only rose to ask a Question.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 121; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 303.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour,Rt.Hn.Gerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell,J.H.M.(Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt. Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hn.Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Green,Walford D.(Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside)
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell,Rt.Hn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan,David J.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,Rt.Hn.A Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley,Hon.M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt.Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES,

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Grey, Rt.Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Harcourt,Lewis V.(Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lyell, Charles Henry
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson,Henry J.(York.W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 121; Noes, 42. (Division List No. 304.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert

Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHn. Gerald W, (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J (Londonderry, S.)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, RtHnSir H.E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. HnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Henry J. Wilson and Mr. Moss.

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the issue out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding in the whole £2,600,000, as are required for making the Advances to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited), under an Agreement with that Company, dated 30th July, 1903, and approved by the House of Commons 12th August, 1903, to authorise the Treasury to borrow money, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for the issue of such sums or the repayment thereof, the principal of and interest on such bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make other provisions relating to the said Agreement.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report this Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided;—Ayes, 121; Noes, 42. (Division List No. 305.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M. (Dublin Univ.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis, (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, J (Londonderry, S.)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard) Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kerr. John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cullinan, J.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Levy, Maurice
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rickett, J. Compton
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr Henry J. Wilson and Mr. Theodore Taylor

Resolution to be reported this day.

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Six of the clock a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 3rd August, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London and India Docks Company Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill, as amended to be considered To-morrow.

*Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power-Gas Bill [Lords]; Belfast Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Beaufort; Blaina; Brynmawr; Ebbw Vale; Manchester (two); Nantyglo; Nosterfield; Victoria (Mon.); Waun Llwyd; and West Tanfield; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL.

Petition from Kettering, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION ACTS.

Petition from Derby, for repeal; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT (No. 2) 1904.

Copy presented, of despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul General at Cairo, inclosing a Report by Sir William Garstin, G.C.M.G., Under-Secretary of State for Public Works in Egypt, upon the Basin of the Upper Nile [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, 1903-4.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th July; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 300.]

CHANNEL ISLANDS (CROWN RIGHTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th March; *Sir Charles Dilke*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 301.]

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 422 (Gibraltar, Annual Report for 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Adjournment Motions under Standing Order No. 10. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed. [No. 302.]

Closure of Debate (Standing Order No. 26). Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed. [No. 303.]

Divisions of the House. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Public Bills. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Public Petitions. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Select Committees. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Sittings of the House. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

Business of the House (Days occupied by Government and by private Members). Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed. [No. 304.]

Private Bills and Private Business. Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; *Mr. Caldwell*]; to be printed.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES, 1903.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum and Statistical Tables showing the production and consumption of Alcoholic Beverages (Wine, Beer, and Spirits) in the various Countries of Europe, in the United States, and in the principal British Colonies; and the Revenue derived therefrom in recent years (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 335, of Session 1901)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894 (ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT.

Return ordered, "showing, according to the accounts for the twelve months preceding the 31st day of March, 1904, furnished to the Local Government Board under Section 1 (7) of The London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894—

(1) The amounts paid during the year out of the Equalisation Fund under the Act to the Corporation of the City of London and each of the Councils of the Metropolitan Boroughs to whom payments out of that fund were made;

(2) The amount of the expenses incurred during the year by each of these authorities (a) under The Public Health (London) Act, 1891 including expenses of scavenging streets); (b) in respect of lighting; and (c) in respect of streets (other than the expenses of scavenging); and

(3) The amount expended during the year by each such authority out of the sums received by them under the Act (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 338, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Grant Lawson.*)

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Copy ordered, "of Treasury Minute, dated the 30th day of July, 1904, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of Sixty-five; and of the Return therein referred to."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Return ordered, "of all the Draft Provisional Orders under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which in the Session of 1904 have been reported on by Commissioners; together with the names of the Commissioners; the first and also the last day of the sittings in each group; the number of days on which each body of Commissioners sat; the number of days on which each Commissioner has served; the number of days occupied by each

Draft Provisional Order before the Commissioners; the Draft Provisional Orders, the Preambles of which were reported to have been proved; and the Draft Provisional Orders, the Preambles of which were reported to have been not proved."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Penalties for Illegal Trawling.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will consider the expediency of introducing legislation next session such as will render the penalties for illegal trawling of a more deterrent nature than at present.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I can only refer the hon. Member to the Answer to a similar Question on 7th March last,[†] to which I have nothing to add.

H.M.S. "Jackal" and Protection of Scotch Fisheries.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland, seeing that the steam trawler "Goldseeker" has been placed at the disposal of the Fishery Board for Scotland to assist in the International North Sea Investigations, will he explain why H.M.S. "Jackal" was detailed by the Board for that duty, especially having regard to the fact that the "Jackal" was lent to the Board for the purpose of protecting the interests of line fishermen from the depredations of illegal trawling off the coasts of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The "Jackal" has been specially engaged on certain occasions in the International North Sea Investigations with the consent of the Admiralty at the request of the Fishery Board. This request has been made because the particular work in question could hardly have been performed without the assistance of a vessel possessing the power and equipment of the "Jackal."

Durness Medical Case.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been called to the Durness Medical case; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I can only refer the hon. Member to my Answer to his Question of Monday last.[‡]

Closing of Dilapidated China and Earthenware Factories.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the statement at p. 219 of the Factories Annual Report, to the effect that many china and earthenware factories are dilapidated and in great need of hygienic improvement; and whether, seeing that recommendations for the closing of the worst of such factories have been made since 1893 by Committees and by Government experts appointed to advise the Government upon the dangerous processes, and in view of the power under Section 18 of The Factory and Workshops Act, 1901, to carry out such recommendations, he will state whether any such steps have been taken in the Potteries; and, if not, whether he will take such action.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I am aware of the statement in the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and of the recommendations to which the right hon. Baronet refers. The Inspector of Factories, however, has no power to require the alteration or demolition of dilapidated premises. Section 18 of the Factory Act only gives power to the inspector to apply to a Court to make an order, and before an order can be made he is required to prove to the satisfaction of the Court that the condition of the premises is such as to be dangerous to health or to life or limb. So far no case has appeared strong enough to make an application under that section advisable. The general condition of the factories, though bearing little on the special dangers of the pottery industry is, however, one to which the inspectors give attention, and it is reported to me that during the past few years a considerable amount of renovation has been done and the general condition substantially improved. Some also of the older factories have been closed. The matter shall not be lost sight.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cxxxi., 309.

[‡] See page 258.

Revenue Derived from Special Delivery of Letters on Public Holidays.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Postmaster-General, in view of the fact that on public holidays in Scotland, and on bank holidays in England and Ireland, letters arriving after the morning delivery for residents who do not rent private boxes can only be obtained on payment of a charge of 3d., will he state the amount derived annually from this source in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There are no statistics available to enable me to reply to the Question of the hon. Member, and the compilation of such statistics would involve a large amount of labour.

Alleged Carelessness in Affixing Post-marks.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the carelessness in the post offices of the United Kingdom in affixing post-marks which are often illegible on letters; and, if so, what action he is taking to remedy the alleged grievance of the public in this respect.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Attention has frequently been called to the necessity of care in applying post-marks to letters, and I am fully alive to the importance of the subject. The cover which the hon. Member was so good as to send me appears to have enclosed a bulky letter, and the indistinctness of the post-marks thereon was doubtless due to this fact. The American post-mark on the back is also indistinct from the same cause. However, I am again calling attention to the point.

Memorial of London Sorter-Tracers.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the Report of the Committee on Post Office Wages having now been presented, he can now accede to the memorial of the London sorter-tracers, dated 26th March last, for permission to personally lay before him their claims as regards pay and prospects of promotion.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) As I informed the hon. Member, in answer to a previous Question on the 6th June last,† until the Report of the Committee on Post Office Wages has been fully considered, I am not prepared to give a definite answer to the request of the memorialists.

Physical Degeneration — Inquiry into Purity of Manufactured or Prepared Food.

MR. ROUND (Essex, Harwich): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the alleged physical degeneration of the people, he will take steps to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Arsenical Poisoning by appointing a special expert officer to inquire into and advise upon all questions affecting the purity of manufactured or prepared food whether of home or foreign origin.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have not at present come to a decision on the subject. The recommendations of the Royal Commission are now receiving my attention, and in connection with them I shall consider the proposal to appoint a special expert officer of the kind suggested.

Foodstuffs as Contraband of War—Correspondence with late Boer Government.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will he lay upon the Table the correspondence between the British Authorities in South Africa and the late Boer Government in which the British Authorities in South Africa declared foodstuffs to be a contraband of war.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I am not aware of any such correspondence.

Appointments of British Officers to the Egyptian Army.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the strength of the Egyptian

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 781.

Army has recently been augmented by the appointment of British commissioned officers; and will he state the number of these appointments and why they have been made, having regard to the fact that after the pacification of the Soudan a reduction was made in the number of both native officers and rank and file.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) We have no information of an increase in the strength of the Egyptian Army.

Life-saving Appliances on Foreign Ships plying between British and Continental Ports.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Trade how many passenger steamers are plying from British ports to Hamburg, Rotterdam, Antwerp, Ostend, Calais, Dieppe, Cherbourg, Havre, and Bordeaux under a foreign flag and manned by foreign sailors; what steps are taken to ensure their compliance with the Merchant Shipping (Life-Saving Appliances) Act of 1888 as to the provision of easily accessible life-belts and life-saving gear for every passenger they are licensed to carry; and by whom and how often are such life-saving appliances inspected and tested.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Foreign steamers taking passengers from ports in the United Kingdom to the ports mentioned in the Question are not required by the existing law to be provided with life-saving appliances under the Merchant Shipping Act. I cannot, without considerable inquiry, state the number of such steamers.

Education Code—Extraneous Duties Clause.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether after 1st August, 1904, Article 15 (the Extraneous Duties Clause) of the Education Code for 1904, will be applied to all agreements, whether made before or after that date, in continuance of the practice of the Board of Education with respect to the corresponding clause in the Code of 1903.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Article 71* of the Code for 1903 applied and still applies (unless the provisions of Article 15 of the Code for 1904 are adopted in its place) to all agreements with teachers in voluntary schools made before 31st July, 1904. Article 15 of the Code for 1904 applies to all appointments of teachers in council as well as voluntary schools made on or after 1st August, 1904, whether such appointments are made by agreement or minute. The Board are advised that a revision of existing agreements would have needed a fresh stamping of each agreement, and this would have caused a considerable expense to fall either upon teachers or managers or local authorities. The Board, therefore, refrained from making the new provisions obligatory, though it is possible for the alteration to be made in any agreement or minute.

Proposed South African War Memorial.

SIR E. DURNING-LAWRENCE (Cornwall, Truro): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if any decision has been arrived at in connection with a proposal to erect an archway or memorial at the eastern end of the Mall Extension, to commemorate those who died during the South African War; and whether His Majesty's Government contemplates the erection of any such memorial in London.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The Government have given very careful consideration to this proposal, but they regret that they are unable to appropriate the archway which is to be erected at the east end of the Mall Extension for this purpose. They do not think that it would prove a suitable building for a memorial of this kind; nor can they undertake to find any other site. In view of the fact that memorials to those who fell in the war have been and are being erected in most parts of the United Kingdom and the Empire, the Government are not prepared to say that the proposal for a national memorial in London seems to be generally regarded as desirable.

Pay of Riding Masters and Quartermasters of the British Army serving in India.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether representations have been made to the

Indian Government and the Commander-in-Chief in India to the effect that riding-masters and quartermasters of the British services doing duty in India receive less pay and allowances than they would be entitled to receive if serving at home, and moreover that, while all British service officers doing duty in India receive an increase of pay while so employed, no such increase is given to riding-masters and quartermasters; and whether he will examine into and redress any difference which may exist in the pay of those ranks.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) No official recommendation has been made to me on the subject of the Indian pay and allowances of riding-masters and quartermasters of the British service doing duty in India, but I will see that the attention of the Government of India is drawn to the matter.

Extension of a Six-day Licence.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that two justices gave permission for publicans holding a six-day licence to keep open their premises on Sunday, 24th July last, and that a special Court was held, and the order rescinded; and, if so, will he say what action, if any, has been taken against those who sold drink on the day prohibited.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Proceedings will be instituted against the publicans in question.

Police and Party Emblems in Armagh.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 23rd July last a number of publicans in Armagh hung out flags from their premises; and whether, in view of the fact that the police warned them of the illegality, he will state what action, if any, he intends taking in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The warning was given in error, the police authorities having misunderstood the effect of the instructions issued by Government. The flags displayed were not of a Party character, and in the circumstances it is not proposed to take further action.

Townlands between Moy and Trew Station

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the names of the ten townlands between Moy and the station at Trew and Moy, county Tyrone; the area which these ten townlands cover; and through how many of the ten townlands the main road actually passes.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The townlands are Trew, Bogbane, Bovain, Gortrea, Turleenan, Clonmore, Drumgrannon, Moyroe, Drumard, and Dromeenagh. They cover an area of 1,883 acres. Two other townlands, Listamlet and Lisroan, with an area of 300 acres, adjoin the main road, which touches all the townlands named.

Essex Farmers and Colchester Camp Straw Contracts.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of allowing Essex farmers to contract for the supply of straw for Colchester Camp, seeing that Belgian peat moss litter, which has only been in use for the last six months, is dearer than straw at present prices.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The hon. and gallant Baronet has been somewhat misinformed. A contract for straw for the troops at Colchester already exists, and is held by an Essex man. Experiments are, however, being made at this and other stations in the use of peat moss litter in lieu of straw as bedding for horses, at a less cost to the public.

The New Army Scheme.

SIR CARNE RASCH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the propriety of excepting such battalions from absorption as have been up to strength since the date of their formation, and are in a high state of efficiency, such as the Royal Fusiliers; whether the reduction will proceed simultaneously in each regiment; and whether officers of the reduced battalions will have the option of transfer to other corps.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The whole question as to the manner in which the reductions mentioned will be carried out is now receiving careful consideration; and while any suggestions of my hon. and gallant friend will naturally receive attention, it is not possible for me at the present moment to reply definitely to this or similar Questions.

Chartered Company and the Future Government of Rhodesia.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there are any proposals submitted, either by the Chartered Company of South Africa or by British citizens residing in Rhodesia, to him in regard to the future Government of Rhodesia; whether, if so, these proposals are now under discussion; whether one scheme is now under his consideration, to alter or to amend the Government of Rhodesia in connection with the Chartered Company; whether he can state what are the guarantees of interest given by the Chartered Company in connection with railroads and other such undertakings, and what is the amount of the debenture debt of the company; and whether he can give this House an assurance that no changes involving expenditure of moneys, or alteration of the terms of the Charter of the company will be made before they have been submitted to the approval of this House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The Answer to the first three Questions is in the negative. As to the fourth Question, I am not in a position to state what are the guarantees of interest by the British South Africa Company subsisting at the present moment nor the amount of the debenture debt of the Company outstanding, but if the hon. Member wishes I will communicate with the Company on the subject. With regard to the last Question, all I can say is that any arrangement involving an obligation on the Exchequer would, of course, be subject to the approval of Parliament, which would have all possible opportunities of discussing it.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Egyptian Finance—The Caisse de la Dette.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the functions of the Caisse de la Dette will come to an end in 1912.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The Caisse de la Dette will continue to exist until the Guaranteed, Privileged, and Unified Debts are entirely extinguished or paid off. By the Khedivial Decree this cannot happen before 15th July, 1912.

Protection of Mecca Pilgrims.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is now in a position to state the arrangements made by the Egyptian Government for the safety and protection of pilgrims during the next year's pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina.

EARL PERCY: The moment has not yet come to make the arrangements for the next pilgrimage. When it does, the Egyptian Government will doubtless take the necessary measures for the protection of the Egyptian pilgrimage.

The Transvaal—Gold Goods by Parcel Post.

MR. WILLIAM McKILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the postal authorities refuse to accept gold goods, manufactured or unmanufactured, for conveyance to the Transvaal by parcels post, although such goods may be sent by parcels post to Natal, Cape Colony, and Orange River Colony, and that this regulation, made by the late Boer Government, was allowed to fall into disuse until recently, he will explain why it has been re-enforced; and whether, seeing that the only other means of sending such goods into the Transvaal is by steamer, the cost of which is almost prohibitive in the case of small parcels, and that all goods sent to South Africa by parcels post are sent at the consignor's or consignee's risk, the Post Office refusing to accept any liability whatever, he will take steps, in view of the inconvenience which these regulations cause both to importers and exporters, to have them altered without delay.

THE POSTMASTER - GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The prohibition to which the hon. Member refers is enforced at the request of the Transvaal Post Office. That Post Office is within its rights in laying down such a prohibition, and I have no ground for interfering in the matter, and no alternative but to accede to its request.

Tain (Ross-shire) Postal Arrangements.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, in view of the fact that, on the 7th July last, the delivery of letters from the post office at Tain, Ross-shire, after the morning delivery, was suspended on the ground that it was a public holiday, and that a resident who called at the post office for the purpose of obtaining his letters was told that no search could be made for them unless he paid a fee of threepence, will he consider the expediency of making such arrangements as will enable the public, when deliveries have been thus suspended from any post office in the United Kingdom, to obtain their letters on week days free of all charge by calling at the post office during the hours it is open for public business.

LORD STANLEY: I doubt if there is any real need for the concession suggested by the hon. Member, but I will consider the question.

Wrongful Conviction—Compensation for Adolf Beck.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any and, if so, what, compensation will be made to Adolf Beck, who in 1895 was tried, convicted, and sentenced to seven years penal servitude at the Old Bailey for a crime of which his innocence has now been conclusively established, and who recently has been tried and convicted for a crime of which his innocence has been established in the interval between conviction and sentence, both convictions having been obtained on evidence of Beck's identity, which was mistaken; and what other steps will be taken to make some reparation to this man in addition to the conferring on him of a pardon for crimes he never committed.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am in communication with the Treasury with regard to the grant of a sum of money—the amount of which I cannot yet state—to Mr. Adolf Beck as compensation, if it can be so called, for his two mistaken convictions. He has already received from the King His Majesty's free pardon, the effect of which is much greater than the word "pardon" in its ordinary sense would imply. In law a free pardon entirely wipes out the conviction and "obliterates every stain" which the law attaches to the alleged offence.

Physical Deterioration — Committee's Suggestions on Ventilation and Child Rearing.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will consider the expediency of issuing to parochial medical officers, sanitary inspectors, and inspectors of poor, leaflets containing the opinions of the Committee on Physical Deterioration relative to ventilation and the bringing up of young children, with a view to the dissemination of information on these subjects amongst the families of the working classes.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): As I intimated in reply to a Question on Monday,† I have not yet been able to consider the Report of the Committee referred to, which has only just been issued. Hence I am not at present in a position to state what action I shall take in connection with the matter. I will, however, take note of the suggestion of the hon. Member.

Trawling in Belfast Lough.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the regulations laid down by the Irish Fisheries Board have been repeatedly broken by trawlers on the northern and southern shores of Belfast Lough, to the damage of the local fishery; and will he state whether any, and, if so, how many, prosecutions have taken place in consequence, and with what results.

---

† See page 270.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): No complaint has reached the Department. The matter, however, is being inquired into.

Motor-Car Scheme for Derry.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Cowan, the chief engineering inspector to the Local Government Board of Ireland, has reported that it would cost over £12,000 sterling to prepare between ninety and twenty miles of the existing public roads in the Derry No. 1 District for the running of motor vehicles, under the scheme of Lord Iveagh and the Right Hon. W. J. Pirrie, between Derry, Clandy, Park, and Fermoy; and that, in consequence of the cost, the scheme has been rejected by the Derry County Council; if so, will he state how many motors have been placed on the Irish roads up to the present under the Iveagh-Pirrie scheme, and at what cost to the several districts; and whether, in view of the cost which the scheme is likely to involve to the local ratepayers, he will refuse to accord it any further the support and co-operation of the Irish Administration.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Mr. Cowan's Report was to the effect stated. The county surveyor also estimated the cost at over £12,000, and the county council declined to adopt his report on the ground that it "would effectually block any further consideration" of the motor-car scheme in the district. I may remind the hon. Member that, acting on a suggestion which had been made by the Galway County Council, the Government put on the Paper an Amendment to the Labourers Bill which would have enabled the whole or any part of the unexpended balance of a county's share in the Exchequer's contribution for labourers' cottages to be expended for particular purposes, such as the cost of schemes referred to in the Question. I understand that the county Antrim service will be opened at an early date.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): May I ask whether, if the right hon. Gentleman expects the county councils to spend money for this purpose, he will lay before the ratepayers the probable benefits that will accrue from such expenditure?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I understand the hon. Member thinks I ought to make some such statement.

Mr. CULLINAN: I think so.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I will consider what can be done.

Portadown Disturbances.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, 24th July, stones and other missiles were thrown at the 8.40 p.m. train from Armagh when approaching Portadown, and that on the same evening broken glass was strewn over the road between Armagh and Portadown for the purpose of disabling cyclists returning from the ceremonies at Armagh Cathedral; and, if so, will he say whether any action has been taken to prosecute the offenders, and how many arrests have been made.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No stones or other missiles were thrown at this train. A small quantity of broken glass was found on the road between Armagh and Portadown. It was removed by the police, who, however, have no reason to believe that it was placed on the road to injure cyclists attending the ceremonies at Armagh Cathedral. The road is much frequented by cyclists.

East Limerick Rent Appeals.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the number of appeals in East Limerick, in the fixing of fair rents, from the decisions of the Sub-Land Commissioners to the Head Commissioners; and whether, in view of the inconvenience to intending purchasing tenants, and the uncertainty between land agents and tenants when rents are being collected, can he say where and at what probable date the Head Commissioners will sit to give decisions on those appeals.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There are 450 appeals pending from this district. It is probable that a sitting of the Appeal Court will be held at Limerick towards the end of the present year.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants in Limerick.

Mr. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, can he say whether the Estates Commissioners have received any communications with regard to reinstatement to the farms from which they have been evicted, in the following cases, viz.; the representative of the late Timothy Hartigan, of Beltyville, Manister Croom, county Limerick, and Denis M'Carthy, of Killanahan, Manister Croom, county Limerick, both under the same landlord, the Rev. J. T. Lee, Papworth Everard Rectory, St. Ives, Cambridge; can he say who manages the evicted farms for the landlord; and can he hold forth to Messrs. Hartigan and M'Carthy any hope of restoration to their farms in the near future.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Applications have been received from both evicted tenants. The holdings are managed for the landlord by the agent of the property. The Commissioners hope to take the applications into consideration at an early date.

King Harman Estate, County Longford.

Mr. BLAKE (Longford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the decision of the Estates Commissioners upon the application of Patrick Fox, of Ardnacraney, Moate, county Westmeath, to be restored to his farm on the King Harman Estate, in the townland of Cartron, barony of Shule, from which he was evicted in June, 1888, and which is now in the landlord's possession; whether he is aware that the King Harman (Newcastle) Estate, county Longford, part of which this farm is, is now being sold; and will he direct the Estates Commissioners to take Fox's application into their favourable consideration before the sale of this estate is sanctioned.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No decision has yet been arrived at. The application is at present under consideration by the Commissioners.

Case of Constable Anderson, Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the most material portions of the evidence given at the Court of inquiry on the charges against Constable Anderson in December, 1903, were suppressed in all the newspapers which reported the trial; and whether, seeing that it has been stated on behalf of the Government that this evidence is at the disposal of the public, he will agree to furnish a certified copy of the evidence.

The following Questions on the same subject also appeared on the Paper—

Mr. DILLON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table all official Papers and Correspondence connected with the case of Constable Anderson of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table of the House all official Papers and Correspondence connected with the case of Constable Anderson of the Royal Irish Constabulary, formerly stationed at Kiltimagh, county Mayo.

Mr. WYNDHAM: My noble friend the Lord Chancellor of Ireland stated on the 12th July that a report of the evidence taken at the Court of inquiry appeared in the public Press. I stated on the following day that I was not prepared to lay Papers on the Table.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the most material parts of the evidence were suppressed in the newspaper reports, so that the public had no opportunity of forming a proper judgment?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think that this House can rehearse the proceedings of the Courts of inquiry with any advantage.

MR. MACVEAGH: Has not the right hon. Gentleman rehearsed them without taking evidence?

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: And I can tell the right hon. Gentleman that the matter will be further rehearsed this afternoon.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the newspaper reports themselves indicate that all the evidence is not given?

MR. WYNDHAM: That may be so, but it does not alter my opinion.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN rose.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question has been fully answered.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: But, Sir, it is absolutely essential we should have this evidence before us in order that we may properly discuss this matter.

*MR. SPEAKER: It has been asked for, and an Answer has been given.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that two Lords-Lieutenant of Ireland have asked for exactly the same thing — Earls Cadogan and Spencer.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that. I do not think they asked for the proceedings of the Court of Inquiry.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Is it not the fact that Lord Spencer stated in another place that there was a precedent for the production of documents of this kind?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Rate of Interest on Loans for Labourers' Cottages in Ireland.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what rates of interest were charged on loans for labourers' cottages in Ireland prior to 3rd March, and what rates are now charged; and at whose instance and on what grounds the increased rate was imposed; whether he is aware that the effect has been the abandonment of schemes for the erection of cottages by numerous district councils; and whether, in view of the failure of the Government to pass comprehensive legislation on the subject this session, he will make representations to the Treasury as to the necessity for reducing the rates of interest now charged.

MR. WYNDHAM: An oral reply to this Question cannot conveniently be given, since it involves the reading out of a large number of figures. With the hon. Member's permission I will circulate the Reply with to-night's Votes.

Irish Local Government Board Surcharges.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board can state the total amount surcharged by their auditors on members of county councils, urban councils, rural district councils, and Poor Law boards from the 31st March, 1899, to 31st March, 1904; how much of this total was remitted by the Local Government Board on appeal to them; and how much was recovered from the parties surcharged.

MR. WYNDHAM: This information would have to be obtained from the officials of the local bodies named. Its preparation would entail a considerable expenditure of labour, and I do not think, as at present advised, that the results would be commensurate with the labour.

Royal Irish Constabulary Recruits.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of recruits received into the Royal Irish Constabulary during the period from 31st March, 1903, to 31st March, 1904.

MR. WYNDHAM: Twenty-five.

Macroom Union Clerkship.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Local Government Board refused to sanction the election of Mr. Lynch as clerk of Macroom Union; whether their attention has been drawn to the recent decision of the Master of the Rolls in this matter; and what steps the Local Government Board now propose to take with regard to the clerkship of Macroom Union.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The matter being *sub judice*, I am debarred from discussing the action of the Local Government Board in respect to the appointment.

Labourers' Cottages in Ireland—Unqualified Tenants.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state in how many cases were complaints made to the Local Government Board during the five years ended 31st March last, as to labourers' cottagers being occupied by persons other than *bona fide* agricultural labourers; in how many cases did the Local Government Board take steps to have the parties so complained of removed from the cottages, and with what result.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Many complaints of this character have been made to the Board, but their number has not been recorded. All such complaints have been communicated to the district councils concerned. The councils have absolute discretion in the matter of letting cottages, and the Board has no power to take action in the direction suggested.

Constable Anderson.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table of the House all official Papers and Correspondence connected with the case of Constable Anderson, a confessed accomplice in perjury, and subornation of perjury, and the perpetration of outrage of Sergeant Sheridan, now discharging duty in the depot of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Phœnix Park.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. I may perhaps add that this is not the Constable Anderson whose case has recently been discussed in the Press.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: No, I know it; and so does the right hon. Gentleman.

Queen's College, Cork—Art Examinations.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the recent examination of candidates for First Arts and Second Arts in the Royal University of Ireland, only one first class distinction was obtained by a student from the Queen's College, Cork, which is endowed, and no fewer than forty-five such distinctions were obtained by the students of the University College, which has no endowment; and whether, seeing that the endowments in Art chairs and prizes of the Queen's College, Cork, produce such small results, he will consider the desirability of diverting them to other educational institutions.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first query is in the affirmative. The number obtained by students of University College was twenty-five not forty-five. The Question does not, however, take account of distinctions that may have been obtained by students in other Faculties besides Arts. I am inquiring as to this.

South Dublin County Police.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a correspondence took place some time since between certain persons in South Dublin County and the Constabulary authorities in Dublin Castle with reference to the manning of certain police stations in that district, and that certain appointments were made in consequence; and, if so, whether the correspondence, if it exists, will be laid upon the Table of the House or otherwise published.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Inspector-General is unable to identify the matter referred to in the Question. If the hon. Member will communicate to me privately a clue to the correspondence I shall be happy to make further inquiry.

Irish Assistant School Teachers.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when steps will be taken to secure that an assistant teacher can be employed in schools in which the average attendance is fifty children.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have nothing at present to add to my reply to the Question of yesterday by the hon. Member for North Cork.†

Lord Dunraven's Limerick Estate.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether Lord Dunraven has sold, or has arranged to sell, his estate in the county of Limerick to the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, at what price.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No application for the sale of this estate has yet been received.

Lord Southwell's Limerick Estate.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether Lord Southwell's Estate, in the county of Limerick, has been sold to the tenants; if so, at what price; and whether Julius Baker, of Ballingrane, in the said county, representative of Anne Baker, deceased, an evicted tenant on the estate, will be reinstated; and, further, will he state what provision is being made for the other evicted tenants on the property.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No application has been received for the sale of this estate.

Queen's College, Cork—Art Course Examination Failures.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how many students of the Queen's College, Cork, holders of prizes, exhibitions, and scholarships in that institution have failed during the last five years to pass the ordinary examinations in the Arts Course of the Royal University of Ireland.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Students of the Queen's Colleges holding scholarships, exhibitions, or prizes in the Faculty of Arts do not necessarily present themselves for the Arts Examination of the Royal University, and some, in fact, do not. The Royal University furnishes an official list of those who pass and of those who obtain honours, but not of those who have failed. I am not sure whether it will be practicable to obtain the information desired in this Question. I will, however, inquire.

Queen's College, Cork—Students and Royal University Art Examinations.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many students of the Queen's College, Cork, submitted themselves at the recent examinations for First and Second Arts in the Royal University; of these, how many are holders of prizes, exhibitions, or scholarships in the Queen's College; how many passed the examination; and how many obtained first class honours, second class honours, first class exhibitions, and second class exhibitions.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Fourteen entered for the First Arts examination; of these ten passed, two of them obtaining second honours, and one of the latter was awarded a second class exhibition. Twelve entered for the Second Arts Examination; nine passed, including one who obtained first class honours and a second class exhibition. The official lists have not yet been communicated to the college authorities by the Royal University and the information desired in the second query cannot at present be given.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said that those who failed were the holders of prizes and exhibitions for the very subjects in which they failed.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge as to that.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: But I have.

Portavogie Harbour Works.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the

---

† See Page.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Down County Council, unanimously adopted by the council, setting forth that the new harbour works at Portavogie are practically useless for the fishermen for whom they were intended; and whether he is aware that during the construction of the harbour the attention of the Commissioners of Works was repeatedly called to the defects in their plans; and what steps the Government now intend to take to make good these defects before asking the county council to take over the care of the harbour.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The harbour works at Portavogie were carried out in accordance with plans deposited for local inspection before the works were started. During the progress of the work additional rock excavation was proposed on behalf of local boatowners, but this would have increased the cost beyond the authorised limit. The harbour gives 250 feet of berthage, and a length of 440 feet of shelter. The works were transferred to the county council in January last.

Belfast Post Office.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the staff in the stamp-selling department of the Belfast General Post Office is limited to two clerks, whereas four clerks would be necessary to deal satisfactorily with the volume of business; that, in consequence of the want of a late-fee box in the interior of the building, the public are obliged to go to Garfield Street in order to post late-fee letters; that the condition of the post boxes in Garfield Street is defective in regard to construction, position, lighting, and time tables; and, if so, whether he will order an inquiry into these matters with a view to having any further cause of complaint in regard to them removed without delay.]

LORD STANLEY: The staff employed in selling stamps at the counter of the Belfast Post Office consists of two officers, and that number is found to be sufficient for the work. It is not usual to provide late-fee boxes at public counters, and I am not aware that inconvenience is caused by the present arrangement. I am assured that the construction, position, and lighting of the posting boxes in Garfield Street are satisfactory, but I will see whether an improvement can be made as regards the exhibition of the posting notices.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Arising out of the reply, may I ask has the noble Lord taken into consideration the fact that the late-fee box is in a corner and strangers doing business in the post office do not see it?

LORD STANLEY: I will look into the matter; but I am informed that there is no inconvenience.

MR. SLOAN: Well, I may tell the noble Lord that I myself when in the post office have been asked by persons where the late-fee box is.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Is it not a fact that it requires four clerks to do similar work in the Dublin office?

LORD STANLEY: I am told not for the same kind of work done.

Dublin Sorting Office—The Corcoran Case.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the defalcation in the Corcoran case was found to have stood roughly at £600 at the time the present Controller of the Sorting Office, Dublin, took over charge from his predecessor, and what was the precise amount of the defalcation at that time; whether any officers now occupying positions of authority or control had at any time borrowed money from Mr. Corcoran; and, if so, who were those officers; whether the present Controller before he attained that position had, in his capacity of chief clerk and examining officer, passed daily for some years falsified entries of cash and stamps in the Daily Cash Account; how far back was the system of false entries found to extend, and what was the amount of the earliest false entry; and what were the dates and amounts of the various I.O.U.'s that formed part of the Controller's cash balance.

Lord STANLEY: The Corcoran case was fully investigated by my predecessor in office at the time, and severe disciplinary measures were taken. In my opinion, no good purpose would be served by again going into such matters as those referred to in the hon. Member's Question after a lapse of four years.

Belfast Post Office—Payment of Telegraph Messengers.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will explain why the day telegraph messengers at Belfast Post Office are only paid at the rate of 6d. a dozen for delivery of telegrams, instead of 7d. a dozen as formerly; and whether, seeing that messengers having more than one telegram for the same person or firm only receive one token, value ½d., instead of a token for each message, he will state what is the rule in other cities and who is responsible for the above arrangement; and will he consider the advisability of granting the messengers payment for each individual message delivered to one firm or person.

Lord STANLEY: The day telegraph messengers at Belfast are paid for delivery of telegrams at the rate of 6½d. a dozen, and not 6d. as the hon. Member appears to think. That rate has been in operation since August, 1899, having then been reduced from 7d., as the higher rate yielded pay beyond what was justified. The rule in force at Belfast that messengers having more than one telegram for delivery at the same address are only paid as for one telegram is in operation generally throughout the service, and I see no reason for making any alteration in this respect.

Mr. SLOAN: Does not the noble Lord see any reason for increasing the payment to 7d. per dozen, the rate at which it originally stood?

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir.

The Scottish Free Church Judgment.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has had time to consider the judgment of the House of Lords in the case of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland *versus* Lord Overtoun; and whether, having regard to the consequences of the judgment, he will be able soon to make a statement respecting any legislative action that may seem to the Government to be desirable.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): The Government have not considered this question, and I do not propose to make any statement on the subject at present.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I will repeat the Question next week.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I doubt whether next week I can give any Answer but the one I have just given.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman, for the convenience of the House, say what items of Supply it is proposed to take to-morrow, and in what order?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that the Supply to be taken to-morrow would be the Home Office Vote and the Navy Vote.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Is not the arrangement that the Navy Vote should be taken at nine o'clock?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, unless the Home Office Vote is completed before seven-thirty. It will be taken immediately after that.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I should like to point out to the right hon. Gentleman we have had no opportunity of discussing the progress of naval works this year.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked what business the Government proposed to take to-night after Supply.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Report of the two Resolutions which we were fortunate enough to get last night.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): Do you propose to take anything after that?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Why not?

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would, in accordance with his promise, give some opportunity for discussing the Cunard Agreement before twelve o'clock at night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am amazed at the hon. Gentleman's Question. We discussed that very question last night, and I should have been glad to meet the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick, who raised it over and over again, if it were possible to give an opportunity to debate the Agreement before twelve o'clock within the few Parliamentary days which remain to us.

MR. LOUGH: I was not here last night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It has come upon me as a surprise that the hon. Member did not take part in our proceedings this morning.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will not the debate on the Navy Estimates automatically close to-morrow at midnight?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it not a fact that no other business than Supply can be taken before midnight on an Allotted Day?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not for me to give a ruling on a point of order, but I think there can be no doubt that my hon. friend has accurately interpreted the purport of the Standing Order.

MR. NANNETTI: When is it proposed to take the Bradford Wages Report?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope an opportunity may be found next week. Clearly there will be none this week.

MR. LOUGH: Was not a promise given of a statement on this matter?

LORD STANLEY: I said I would make a statement when the Vote came on.

MR. NANNETTI: It was distinctly understood that a statement would be made on the Telegraph Vote, and I think it will be a breach of faith if we do not have one.

LORD STANLEY: I will make one if I possibly can, and I will appeal to the Leader of the House to give me an opportunity.

WORKMEN'S TRAINS.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read. [Inquiry not completed.]

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 305.]

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,371, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums."

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said he rose to propose a diminution of the salary of the Chief Secretary by the sum of £100, and he did so with very great regret, having known his right hon. friend for a number of years. Admiring, as he did, his great ability, and believing, as well, that he had the welfare of Ireland at heart, he greeted his appointment as Chief Secretary with very great satisfaction, especially as he knew he did not come there in the character of a novice, for he had made acquaintance with Irish affairs under a notable and successful master.

The right hon. Gentleman was in Ireland when the Prime Minister was Chief Secretary, and the Prime Minister as Chief Secretary did what no other Chief Secretary had done before; he laid, during his tenure of office, the foundation of a great reputation as a statesman. There were three methods by which it was possible to govern Ireland. They might govern Ireland in the interests of the majority of the people; they might govern her in the interests of the minority, or they might govern the country in the interests of Ireland alone, irrespective of both Parties. To his mind the last was the proper way to govern Ireland, and it was the method adopted by the Prime Minister when he was Chief Secretary. The First Lord of the Treasury, regardless of oceans of abuse which were poured upon his head in the North and South of Ireland, achieved his object—the pacification of the country, and, in doing so, he earned the admiration and respect of his opponents, as well as of his political friends. When the present Chief Secretary went over to Ireland to assume the reins of Government, they naturally anxiously looked out for some indication as to which of the three methods of government he would adopt. They had not, however, long to wait until they found the direction—the fatal direction—in which his steps were leading him. That indication was afforded by three appointments which were made to important positions in the Government of Ireland. The first was the appointment of a gentleman who had taken a prominent part in the "Plan of Campaign," Mr. Gill. Another appointment was that of Mr. Finucane, who was made one of the Chief Land Commissioners. The third appointment which indicated the line along which his feet were treading was that of Sir Antony McDonnell. It was a strange thing that the Government of Ireland should seek those who were to help to govern that country from a place like India. He remembered that the late Lord Salisbury once made a speech about "black men and Hottentots," which provoked great ire among hon. Members opposite, but, after all, it was a harmless remark. Still, was it to be assumed that, because a man had successfully governed forty millions of Hindoos, that fact justified his appointment to govern four and three-quarter millions of Irishmen, especially in face of the fact that those Irishmen occupied more of the time of the House of Commons than did the inhabitants of any other portion of the British Empire?

They had not very long to wait before the effect of the appointment of Sir Antony McDonnell became clear. The House would remember that there had been a Dreyfus case in France which very nearly upset the French Republic, and although Captain Dreyfus was a very humble officer, yet the fate of the Republic hung upon his false condemnation without evidence and without a fair trial. Well, he had to tell them that there was an Irish Dreyfus, and had it not been that the case of Constable Anderson had come to their knowledge, had they not been placed in a position to make representations to the Government on the subject of Constable Anderson's treatment, he might now have been a disgraced man, and the woman whom he had married might have borne a dishonoured name. Constable Anderson was a very humble person, but an Irish constable had just as much right to justice as a Jew. Knowing, as he did, the chivalrous character of his right hon. friend, he was certain that when he got up to reply he would take the whole blame in connection with the case on his own shoulders. He would say, "I am the man to blame," but there was no reason—there was no justification for his taking that line of action as the House would realise when he (the speaker) came to relate the circumstances as clearly and as shortly as he could. When it came to his knowledge that this case of gross and incredible injustice had been perpetrated in the twentieth century in Ireland, he went to his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary and related to him as clearly as he could the whole facts of the Anderson case as far as he knew them. Some details had since cropped up, but, at any rate, as the result of what he related to the right hon. Gentleman, the Chief Secretary told him that he had never heard a word about Anderson. He thereupon informed him that it was a case so atrocious that he intended to bring it before the House of Commons, where every man had a right to air his grievances. His right hon. friend suggested that he should delay doing so until he had been able to obtain information in regard to the matter. Well, the right hon. Gentleman got his information, and he thought he would have to admit that he found that the statements which had been made to him were practically borne out by the facts of the case. He noticed that his right hon. friend shook his head as to that, but it was clear that the right hon. Gentleman got certain information, that the Law Officers of the Crown reported upon it, and the result was that Anderson was reinstated, and received his back pay. Therefore, it might be taken that the right hon. Gentleman found out that the statements made to him were amply justified by the facts; otherwise, why should he have reinstated the man and given him his back pay. If he were guilty of the charges made against him he ought never to have been reinstated. If he were innocent, as he had been proved to be, it was only right that he should have been reinstated and should have received his back pay.

It ought to be borne in mind that Constable Anderson had a record of seventeen-and-a-half years service, without one mark against his conduct during the whole of that long period. At the end of that term he committed a crime in the eyes of some persons which cannot be condoned or overcome. He fell in love with a Roman Catholic girl, and the priest of the parish—Father O'Hara—determined that the marriage should never come off. It was well known that the Irish priesthood were opposed to mixed marriages. They refused, and no doubt conscientiously believed they had a right to do so, to allow the gulf, which they themselves had helped to dig between two parts of the population to have a matrimonial bridge thrown across it. How was this to be accomplished? The girl was one of Father O'Hara's own parishioners, she had some property in the parish, and it was desired that her marriage with the constable should be prevented. Father O'Hara appeared to be not only a strong politician but a man capable also of laying very clever plans in order to carry out his own will. He set to work to try and get rid of the constable—to get him sent out of the district. He got hold of witnesses, he interviewed them personally, and some of them, apparently, he instructed as to the accusations which were to be brought against this constable. Those accusations were three in number. In the first place the constable was accused of using obscene language to some little boys in the street on a certain occasion; secondly, the accusation was that he was seen going into a public-house during service hours by a back door and coming out at the front door; and the third accusation, which was the real accusation—the grave one which was said to demand his dismissal from the force—was that he had been seen with the girl to whom he was engaged to be married going out on bicycles, that they had been tracked into a wood at ten o'clock at night, and that there had been improper conduct on their part. Such were the three accusations. Those accusations were formulated and sent up to Sir Neville Chamberlain by the rev. Father O'Hara, and the result was that there was inquiry into them. In the end Anderson was declared to be not guilty of any of the charges.

One would have imagined that in any civilised country there would then have been an end of the case so far as those particular accusations were concerned, and that they would have vanished into thin air. But nothing of the kind happened here. When a priest once set out to accomplish a certain thing he was not to be easily stopped. Father O'Hara consequently took further steps. Now he came to another point. On a certain occasion he made a speech in Ireland—it was last year—and mentioned the fact that Father O'Hara had been in direct communication with Sir Antony McDonnell in this very case. He made the accusation in public, it appeared in print, and his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary very properly, no doubt, took exception to the speech, and wrote him a letter stating that he was perfectly wrong in the allegation he had made. He wondered whether the right hon. Gentleman still adhered to that opinion. He remembered that in answer to a Question very recently in that House the right hon. Gentleman had admitted that Father O'Hara and Sir Antony McDonnell had had a conversation at a

Colonel Saunderson.

meeting of the Congested Districts Board on that particular case, when it was still *sub judice*. He had no doubt when he made that charge, and he repeated it now, that this was a got-up job between Father O'Hara and Sir Antony McDonnell.

But what had since occurred? After the acquittal of this constable on all three counts, Sir Antony McDonnell decided that there should be a public and sworn inquiry into the transaction. He would like to know where Sir Neville Chamberlain came into the matter. Still, the sworn inquiry was held into the conduct of the constable, and at that inquiry nothing new was brought forward beyond the three counts upon which Anderson had already been acquitted. Witnesses were brought up to prove the charges, but no new accusations were made. The witnesses said all they had to say, and what was the result. It transpired that the witnesses who testified against Constable Anderson had been in direct communication with Father O'Hara, and one boy, who accused the constable of making use of obscene language, admitted in his evidence that he went to Father O'Hara's house. He was asked, "Were you speaking to Father O'Hara?" and his reply was, "No, he was speaking to me." What did it mean, the priest of the parish getting a boy eleven years of age to his house, and telling him what he would have to prove against the policeman? Why, no one would hang a dog on such evidence. All the witnesses, apparently, had been in direct communication with Father O'Hara, and that induced him to believe that it was a got-up job, that it was a nefarious conspiracy against one unhappy man—a weak man on the one side, and the power of the Irish priesthood and the permanent Under-Secretary for Ireland on the other. What chance had the single man.

He would not weary the House by going through the evidence. It could be seen by anyone who took the trouble to examine it that the people who bore testimony against Anderson were all personally animated against him. For instance, there was the public-house keeper. He admitted that he was personally antagonistic to Anderson, and it appeared from the evidence of the county inspector that Anderson had been particularly active in dealing with public-houses which sold liquor during illegal hours. Luckily for Anderson the accusation against him as to having been seen going into the public-house on a Sunday was borne out by his own testimony, for he entered in the police diary—as it was his duty to—the fact that he had visited this particular house. Then as to the question of misconduct in the wood, that was by far the most serious question. He had never conceived that there could be such a lack of chivalry on the part of Irishmen as had been displayed by hon. Members opposite in this case. With all their faults, Irishmen were supposed to have the one virtue of chivalry, and if they only read Tom Moore they would see what value he attached to the gem of virtue in womanhood. When he found that the hon. Member for East Mayo had on the Paper the Question, which was, he believed, actually put to the Chief Secretary by the Member for South Kilkenny, in regard to the poor woman whose name had been mixed up with this case, asking whether the girl that Anderson had married was the one with whom this misconduct was alleged to have taken place, he thought that all chivalry was dead. He had never thought to see in the House of Commons a man who would try to destroy the honour of one of his fellow-countrywomen by an invidious and odious Question such as that—a Question unworthy of an Irishman and of a Member of the House of Commons. He naturally put down a Question immediately afterwards. He was not going to allow an atrocious slander to be put upon the Paper without reply, and he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether the Government had evidence that this girl, who had been brought to Dublin by her mother and examined there by doctors, who had declared her to be *virgo intacta*, was the same with whom it was suggested the misconduct had taken place, and he got a reply in the affirmative, so that, at any rate, whatever the unfortunate circumstances in this case, the girl had emerged from the controversy with her honour untarnished.

Constable Anderson was now living in another part of Ireland. But what he wanted the House to consider was that there was something infinitely more serious than the constable's reputation at stake. How were they going to deal with a force which, under the most difficult conditions, had always been true to their rule. What would members of the Royal Irish Constabulary do if evidence of this kind was to be got up against them for venomous and malicious purposes, and they were to be placed at the mercy of any conspirators? That was a serious question which the House ought to consider. The Anderson case was not the only one which showed how the wind was blowing. Another case happened only the other day at a place called Roundstone in Connemara. Happily, however, there was no woman concerned in that, but still it was almost as bad as the Anderson case. At the time the incident occurred Roundstone was anticipating a visit from the Archbishop of Tuam, and naturally great preparations were being made with flags and banners to give him a reception. At Roundstone there were two Protestant constables. These were met in the street by a public-house keeper, who had a large display of bunting over his establishment, and who asked them—knowing that there was some difficulty in the law with regard to the display of flags over such establishments—if they thought he was outside the law in allowing the flags to fly. The constables replied that perhaps he might be, and he thereupon said he would take the flags down. But at that they both remonstrated with him, and said they were not sure of the position, and that they had no authority to ask him to remove the flags. Was it a crime for the policemen to give their opinion or advice when asked for it? These men simply did that, and one would have imagined that nothing more would have happened. There was, however, a priest in the parish, Father Gleeson, who seemed to be very much of the same sort as Father O'Hara, and he apparently communicated with Sir Antony McDonnell. Then, without any trial and without being given any opportunity of defending themselves, these two constables found one day that a superior officer came down to administer to them a severe reprimand for their conduct. They did not know what they had done; they did not know who was their accuser, and very naturally they refused to lie down under the censure. They accordingly asked for a public inquiry. One of the constables had now been transferred —not of his own free will—but the other still remained in the place. The Chief Secretary, in answer to a Question which was addressed to him the other day, said it was not owing to this incident that the constable had been removed, but he was bound to say that the facts were very suspicious. At any rate, the men demanded to know the name of their accuser, and the nature of the charges brought against them, in order that they might have an opportunity of refuting them. This appeared to have caused some excitement at headquarters. He supposed the shadow of the Anderson case had fallen over the Castle, and the result was that orders were issued for an inquiry, and the men were examined for the first time respecting the charges of this priest, Mr. Gleeson.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Father Gleeson, if you please. He has as much right to be called the Rev. as you have to be called Colonel. He is a much better man.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said that was beside the question. The rev. Father Gleeson had received a letter from Sir Antony McDonnell communicating to him the written protests of both these constables. Had anyone ever heard of such a proceeding as that? These documents were invariably held to be confidential, and he ventured to say that if any Member of the House had asked for the reproduction of a communication of that kind the right hon. Gentleman would have refused it. But here they had the case of a parish priest writing up to the Deputy-Governor of Ireland, and getting from him a copy of the protests of these men. That was not the way to conduct Irish affairs, and it was not the way to maintain discipline and honour in the Irish Constabulary Force. His object in bringing this matter forward, and in proposing the reduction of the salary of the Chief Secretary, was to make, before the session closed, a protest against a system of government in Ireland which had been tried in the past, and had hitherto ended in disastrous failure. One thing, at any rate, loyalists of northern Ireland, including as they did many Roman Catholics, looked upon with abhorrence. and that was the degrading spectacle of a human being being jumped upon by priests. To that they would never consent. He spoke, however, of course, for a small minority of Members. They were, no doubt, a small Party in the House, but at the same time ventured to say that, though small in numbers, they represented the greatest constituency in the Empire. They represented the loyal men from the Giant's Causeway down to Cape Clear, and wherever they heard of injustice being perpetrated, upon whomsoever it might be, they would exercise their undoubted right to raise their voices in the House of Commons in protest against it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, That a sum not exceeding £14,271, be granted for the said Service.—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.) admired the courage of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, who did not whisper vituperation like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Belfast, who was leaving the House, who was in fact an evicted War Minister, after having grabbed his position in the Cabinet. The right hon. Gentleman was leaving the War Office as he had had to leave every position he had ever held, and he had not the courage to face the Irish Members. He was glad that this question of Constable Anderson had been raised. After all the hysterics on Orange platforms in Ireland and in the yellow organs in this country, it was well that the matter should be threshed out. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had boasted of his great constituency, but some of his colleagues were not likely to be returned to the House at the next general election, and he doubted if the hon. Member for North Antrim would have much cause to smile when that day came. The hon. and learned Gentleman had occupied the position of unpaid private secretary to the Chief Secretary, but he was found to be too dear at the price; he discovered it was not consistent with his idea of Irish patriotism to hold an unpaid office. He had risen to impeach the conduct of the Chief Secretary in connection with one of the most scandalous transactions which had ever been known in the history of Irish administration. The right hon. and gallant Member had complained of certain appointments made by the Chief Secretary. Well, those appointments were the very basis of the Anderson case. Hon. Gentlemen opposite never refused appointments. The Ulster Tory only gave up office when the emoluments were too small. But the right hon. Gentleman should have been the last to complain on that score, for had not his son been appointed an inspector of the Local Government Board at a salary of £1,000 a year?

Several HON. MEMBERS: Two sons have received appointments.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: One is sufficient for my case.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: I never knew my son's salary had been raised.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: Perhaps I am mistaken, but it probably would have been increased had not the right hon. Gentleman raised a Tory revolt in the House of Commons. He did not object to the fact that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had secured an appointment for his own son; probably he was perfectly fitted for the office he held. But surely it did not lie in the mouth of the right hon. Gentleman to attack the Chief Secretary, who certainly had not given appointments to Irish Catholics, who did not want them under the Irish Administration. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had attacked the appointment of Sir Antony McDonnell, a distinguished Governor in India. Was it not remarkable that a man who successfully governed 40,000,000 Hindoos had found it impossible, owing to the garrison of hon. Members opposite, to successfully administer Irish affairs? He was appointed at the direct instigation of the King, but because he was a Catholic——

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member is out of order in introducing His Majesty's name.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Oh, no! Only if it is done for the purpose of influencing debate, and it was not so in this case.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said he would of course bow to the ruling of the Chair. But he trusted that the Chief Secretary would boldly take the responsibility on himself for what had occurred. The hon. Member for South Belfast was the representative of the new democracy, and had recently been returned in direct opposition to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh; simultaneously the hon. Member for South Tyrone was in the right way of capturing Ulster seats, and these two influences combined were producing a happier condition of things in the North. Was this new feeling to be stifled by the present Orange ascendency, the representatives of which were creating a new Dreyfus for the edification of people who did not understand the situation and for the purpose of resurrecting hon. Members for Ulster from the position to which they had been reduced on the land and labourers questions.

They had been told that Constable Anderson had an unblemished record. He would demand that which hon. Members opposite had not ventured to ask for — a full, complete, and impartial inquiry into all the circumstances of the case and into the antecedents of Constable Anderson. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell them something as to Anderson's record when he was moved from Rossport to Mullaghroe? Would the right hon. Gentleman tell them something about the scandals connected with his name when he was sent to Kiltimagh? Could the district inspector and the Protestant clergyman throw any light on the matter? They did not want that day the airy sweet nothings in which the right hon. Gentleman was wont to indulge; they wanted only an impartial inquiry. They did not fear that, neither did Father O'Hara. They had been refused every inquiry and they had been refused the production of documents which would enable the House to understand the case. He agreed that there was something more serious at stake in this matter than the character of a constable. There was involved the honour of the Irish Catholic name. This case had been made a war-cry of in Ireland and even in England. It had been practically asserted by the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh that this was part and parcel of a vile conspiracy against the Protestants of Ireland, and the character of the priests was a chief factor in this vile conspiracy.

Father O'Hara complained against this policeman, who, he said, was not a fit character to be in the parish. It was not for Father O'Hara to decide that, or for the hon. and gallant Gentleman; but for a tribunal appointed under the Constabulary Code. There was no doubt that Father O'Hara wished Anderson to be removed, and complained that he was not fit to be a policeman in a decent community. He maintained that Father O'Hara, who was one of the ablest parish priests in Ireland, was entitled to make a complaint about a matter which affected the conduct and morality of his own parish. A Court of inquiry was held, and the result was that the Inspector-General, who was a Protestant, dismissed this policeman from the force. Something had been said about a first and second inquiry. There was only one inquiry, one properly constituted tribunal. The Court consisted of two sub-inspectors, one a Protestant and the other a Catholic, who took evidence on oath. If Sir Antony McDonnell was charged with being guilty of a base transaction, then these two sub-inspectors should be charged with the same offence. He asked the House whether the judgment of a body of that character was lightly to be dismissed. But what happened? The right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh went to the Chief Secretary and told him that there would be another Ulster revolt if Anderson was not reinstated; and the right hon. Gentleman reinstated this policeman without new evidence and of his own volition—superseded, therefore, the former inquiry and insulted his own tribunal. He wanted to know if that were a proper and constitutional manner of dealing with this question? What confidence could the police of Ireland have in the right hon. Gentleman when he overturned the judgment of the sworn inquiry? The mistake the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had made was not to hold fast by the result of the Court of inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman imagined, however, that he had to stop the mouths of the Unionist Members in Ulster; but if the right hon. Gentleman had known these Members as he ought to know them, all he had to do was to crack the Party whip and they would at once come back to the fold. The right hon. Gentleman thought that the whole thing could be quietly done; but he forgot about compulsory sales, about the Bann, and that the Pope was not so unpopular in Ulster as he used to be. In order to compensate for the loss of the Pope, the Ulster Unionist Party rallied together and clung to the Anderson case as a drowning man clung to a straw.

There were only two ways of having this question settled to the satisfaction of the Irish people. One of them was for the right hon. Gentleman to produce, and lay on the Table of the House of Commons, all the evidence, documents, and correspondence in connection with the case. The right hon. Gentleman would probably state that there was no precedent for such a course and that he had no authority to do so. But Lord Spencer and Lord Cadogan, both ex-Lords-Lieutenant of Ireland, had demanded the production of the correspondence, although from different points of view. Lord Spencer had stated in the other House that there were precedents for producing such documents; why, then, should the right hon. Gentleman hesitate to agree to what had been asked for in both Houses of Parliament? The only people who did not want a full inquiry were the hon. Gentlemen opposite, who had made this case a rallying cry to bring them together. The Chief Secretary could not escape his responsibility; he could not hide behind Sir Antony McDonnell. He must justify his action in superseding the judgment of the Court of inquiry which had been confirmed by the Inspector-General; and must either grant a full inquiry or, as he had already said, place the Papers on the Table of the House.

The right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite had made an attack on Father O'Hara, who was a member of the Congested Districts Board in Ireland. He ventured to say that there was not a more tolerant, broad-minded, or generous priest in all Ireland, or in all the world. His devotion to the cause of the people had made him most popular in the country, and yet this was the priest on whom was concentrated all the attacks of the *Daily Mail* and the *Globe*, and the impeachment which they had just heard from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. Father O'Hara wrote a letter to *The Times*, which they refused to publish—another proof that there was a conspiracy combination between the organ of Pigott in England and the Orange ascendancy gang in the North of Ireland. In that letter Father O'Hara referred *The Times* to Sir David Harrel in witness of his tolerant behaviour in the town of Kiltimagh, and stated that, although there was an overwhelming majority of Catholics in that place, they got up a memorial to the Postmaster-General and obtained the postmastership for a Protestant. In how many cases in Ulster did an overwhelming Protestant majority take similar action? This was the priestly desperado of whom they had heard! He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would clear from the stigma which had been put upon him this priest who was honoured in Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.) said the hon. Member in his speeches always imputed unworthy motives to those who took different views from himself, but if the hon. Member railed at them from morn till dewy eve it would not put them off their food or sleep. He desired to take the earliest opportunity to rebut the charges made by the hon. Member against this unfortunate policeman whom the hon. Member had taken the opportunity of vilifying, who had passed through the fire of affliction, and against whom there was no official record that was unfavourable. His superior officer had stated that he was the best policeman in the district, and it was not until this tolerant priest and his coadjutors set to work to rake up a scandal that the first decision was upset.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said the statement on which he had based his remarks was made in the letter sent by Father O'Hara to the Irish papers which he offered to indemnify if an action for libel was brought against them for publishing it.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE said that showed the source from which this scandal came. The Chief Secretary had no right to whitewash Sir Antony McDonnell at the expense of this humble policeman. The right hon. Gentleman owed loyalty to both these subordinates, and any such action would lead to further disappointment and resentment. He recognised the force of the argument that Sir Antony McDonnell could not reply to criticisms passed on him in that House. But the real answer to that was that Sir Anthony McDonnell should be careful not to place himself in a position from which he could not expect to escape criticism, and further that he had in that House the Chief Secretary or Ireland to defend him. And was it not absurd to say when he acted as an open shameless partisan that they should not have the right to attack him in that House? If ever there was a case in which it would be ludicrous to slur over the acts of Sir Antony McDonnell it was this case. As a matter of moral responsibility they did not think that the Chief Secretary was to blame, because in a letter written by him in July he stated that he had never heard until then of the facts of the matter, so that December, January, and February went by and he never knew about it and could not be held responsible.

There was another matter. There was great disposition shown to treat this case as trivial, and that disposition, he ventured to think, was shown for the benefit of English Members. English Members who were not practically acquainted with the real value of the Royal Irish Constabulary were very apt to be misled by the suggestion that this was a mere trivial police force matter, a mere disciplinary matter, a matter that the Irish police themselves could deal with. Assuming that to be so, however small it might have been in its origin and trivial in its nature, it had led to disastrous results in Ireland. It had convinced the non-commissioned officers and men of the Royal Irish Constabulary that while Sir Antony McDonnell was at the Castle, whenever a priest wished to vilify anyone he had only to write a letter to him. They saw that in the Roundstone case. That was a disastrous state of affairs to have existing in the finest force they had to depend on in Ireland. All through the North of Ireland there was a feeling of unrest and dismay; there was a feeling that whenever a priest wanted a thing he had only got to write a note to Sir Antony McDonnell and the request would be granted, quite irrespective of Protestant interests and of justice. This case was important if they looked at it from a disciplinary point of view; but it was still more important when they found that it was part of a settled policy. It was only one of the many straws showing how the wind blew. They had had the Mills case, the Lewis case, and they had had case after case in which Sir Antony McDonnell had been at the bottom in inflicting injury because the unfortunate person concerned was a Protestant, and still hon. Members opposite would say that there was no bigotry. Well, of course, their views of bigotry and those of his colleagues largely differed.

What was the result of it all? To-morrow when the daily papers came to be read, it would be found, as the result of Irish administration by the Unionist majority, that perhaps for the first time in twenty years votes of the Irish Nationalist Party had been given in support of the permanent Under-Secretary of the Executive. [Nationalist cries of dissent, and a Nationalist: Who told you that?] Well, if not, he trusted it would be because his remarks would have had the effect of having prevented it. Of course hon. Members opposite would welcome anything which would drive a wedge, as this was doing, into the confidence without which the discipline of the Royal Irish Constabulary could not be maintained. So far he and his colleagues had been fighting for the Irish Administration. [Nationalist interruption, and an Hon. Member: For how long?] He would give that hon. Member a nut to crack in a minute. If the question of this policy was made a Government question, the real result would be that they would be forced to reconsider the whole question of the Government of Ireland by Party. By voting against the Amendment of his right hon. and gallant friend the Member for Armagh they would be putting the seal of approval on the policy which was typified and represented by the Anderson case. The whole question which the Committee would have to consider in effect was whether or not the Member for Armagh was correct in saying that they could bring the guilt home to Sir Antony McDonnell. If the Chief Secretary was not responsible, and they unhesitatingly accepted his statement, it followed that there were only two officials in Ireland who could be responsible: one was the Inspector-General and the other the Permanent Under-Secretary. Every effort had been made to make the Inspector-General a scapegoat in this matter, but he (Mr. Moore) thought he could satisfy the House that from the beginning to the end Sir Antony McDonnell alone appeared responsible. Their charge against Sir Antony McDonnell, in the first place, was that he had had extra official and unofficial dealings, behind the back of everybody, with this priest, with a view to the clearing out of this constable from the village of Kiltimagh. How was the Chief Secretary going to answer that? [Mr. FLAVIN: By the inquiry we ask for.] An inquiry would not meet the case. Was the right hon. Gentleman going to give them only the bald statement of Sir Antony McDonnell on the matter, or would he give them an inquiry and lay the correspondence.

There were a great many irregularities in this case. He would call attention to several matters which at least required explanation. In the first place, there was no doubt that the prime mover against this constable was the rev. Mr. O'Hara. He was a colleague of the Chief Secretary on the Congested Districts Board, where he was also a colleague of Sir Antony McDonnell. He wrote to the *Globe* explaining by what feelings he was actuated against this, the only Protestant policeman in Kiltimagh, and he went on to say, "I wish merely to have him cleared out of Kiltimagh." In time an inquiry was held. They then had the statement from the hon. Gentleman who represented that district in this House, to the effect that he wrote to the Chief Secretary. That meant that before the inquiry was held there was a communication from the rev. Mr. O'Hara to Sir Antony McDonnell, and if that was true it was entirely the reverse of what came from Sir Antony McDonnell and what was told them by the Chief Secretary, because the answer of the Chief Secretary on the 29th of June was this—

> "Except on one occasion, no communications, verbal or written, with reference to the case of Constable Anderson passed, prior to his dismissal, between Sir Antony McDonnell and the rev. Denis O'Hara."

There was no doubt that the prime mover against the constable was the rev. Mr. O'Hara; and they now had the statement of the hon. Member opposite that that reverend gentleman wrote to Sir Antony McDonnell to get an inquiry instituted. The first inquiry was conducted by the district inspector, and all the witnesses whom the rev. Mr. O'Hara could produce made statements which were reduced to writing, read over to the witnesses, and signed by them. What was the meaning of that? It was perfectly true that it was not on oath, and it would have been an irregularity if it had been. The meaning was that a district inspector was sent down to see what was the nature of the case to be made. He was the judge of it, and if he found there was no case which could be substantiated against the constable the matter was at an end. It was exactly the same as if on a preliminary investigation the Grand Jury ignored the Bill. He challenged the Chief Secretary to tell the House if there was 1 per cent. of police cases in Ireland where the officer sent down to inquire and report on the spot certified that there was no case in which the matter was ever proceeded with further. This was a complete investigation, and such was the law of England that where an inferior Court had declared a man to be innocent and had acquitted him there was no power in the High Court to review the case. Here was an acquittal, and the matter should have been closed. It was an extraordinary thing, which the Chief Secretary would have to explain to the House, how after the district inspector had acquitted this man there was influence enough at Dublin Castle to get a sworn inquiry into his case. The district inspector's report went to the county inspector, it went to the acting Inspector-General, and it was confirmed by all three. In regard to the charge of immorality, the report said that the man and girl had done nothing which was not the ordinary custom of courting people. The district inspector found on the evidence of the witnesses that there was no evidence to support the charge of impropriety. It was said by the district inspector, and was confirmed by every legal person in authority above him, that against the doubtful evidence they had the constable's unblemished record of seventeen years service. That was the result of what he might call the investigation of the Grand Jury, who threw out the Bill.

It was just at this stage that Father O'Hara had his communication with Sir Antony McDonnell at a meeting of the Congested Districts Board. The priest had made the case, witness after witness deposed to the fact that the priest had had him up at his house, or had met him, and had told him what he had to swear. When the district inspector, who saw these people on the spot, and reduced their statements to writing, came to an adverse conclusion, the priest said he wanted an inquiry where they could make these statements on oath. Was there ever a more ludicrous position? He came to the point now that the hon. Member for Perth suggested. He put it to the House, was he going too far when he said that this tribunal, so extraordinarily appointed, was a packed tribunal, packed in a sense that it was sent down for a specific purpose, to reconsider the same evidence, the only difference being that this time it was to be on oath? Assuming that they went to the length of having a second inquiry—and that was the first stumbling-block the Chief Secretary would have to get over, because it was unusual after an acquittal that there should be a second inquiry—what was the ordinary course in the Constabulary? The House would understand that in Ireland difficulties as to discipline might arise in a county in which officers or men might be implicated. The ordinary practice where a constable, a private, if he might so call him, was concerned, was that the inquiry was invariably conducted by a district inspector from an immediately adjoining division in the same county. That was perfectly reasonable and he wanted to know why that course was not followed in this case? In this case they did a thing which, as far as his information went, had never been done before and certainly not in recent years. They sent a special gentleman down from the depot in Dublin, where he was next door to Sir Antony McDonnell. This young gentleman, a Roman Catholic, who knew quite well that the object of this new inquiry was not to get fresh evidence, but to reverse the previous finding, was sent down from Dublin to take the inquiry. In a case so suspicious as this, brimming over at every stage with irregularities, that course was sufficiently suspicious to justify everyone in looking at the case broadly. The president of the Court was a Roman Catholic, but it was right and fair to say that he had no personal evidence against that officer of any kind. All he said was that the fact that he was sent down was unusual. He was sent down with the knowledge that it was the verdict and not the evidence which was complained of by Sir Antony McDonnell. He also knew that complaint was made to Sir Antony McDonnell at the instance of the priest of what had already happened. He found a verdict, and he asked the House to look at the evidence, which he invited anyone interested in the case to read.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Only parts of the evidence were published.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE: The evidence has been published. The hon. and learned Gentleman will find it in the *Irish Times* of 15th June.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said the full evidence had never been published. The Chief Secretary that afternoon refuted it.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said the evidence he held in his hand was published by the *Irish Times*, a journal of admitted respectability in Ireland, as being sworn evidence at the trial. He could not do better than quote the *Irish Times*, and he was sure it would satisfy his colleagues on that side of the House.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I happen to have in my pocket at the present moment the whole of the evidence published by the *Western People* when the trial took place.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE read extracts from the report of the trial. He went on to say, without fear of contradiction, that if the evidence given before the Court was sifted on cross-examination, Father O'Hara would be found to have been at the back of every witness produced. The Scotch term "adjusting evidence" might be exactly applied to it. If ever evidence was adjusted it was by Father O'Hara in this case. A very extraordinary thing was the haste with which the decision was come to, because the inquiry only terminated on 26th November, and an order dismissing this unfortunate constable from the force was made on 8th December. Matters were so situated under the Royal Constabulary Act that the services of a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary could only be dispensed with by the Lord-Lieutenant, and he acted only on the advice of his secretary, who, in this case, was the Permanent Under-Secretary, Sir Antony McDonnell. The House might take it from him that the advice of the Secretary or Under-Secretary was required before the Lord-Lieutenant would dismiss a man. The importance of that was that it left it no longer a matter in the control of the Inspector-General, but under the law it became Sir Antony McDonnell who had to deal with it. The Chief Secretary had told them that he himself was not cognisant of these matters until February. If the only charge against the constable was that of merely taking liberties with the girl he contended that his dismissal was a monstrous punishment for a man with seventeen years good record in the force. The invariable practice in charges of seduction was for the complainant to be written to, and told to bring her action in the County Court, and then if a wrong had been done the constable was punished. But in the present case the priest was pressing, and Sir Antony McDonnell was willing to oblige him, and so he thought the best way to stop the marriage was by dismissing Anderson.

He was bound to say that the Chief Secretary had acted like a gentleman, and that when he found a wrong had been done he did nothing but what was to his infinite credit. It was hard upon the Chief Secretary that matters of which he was not cognisant should take this disgraceful shape, and that he should have to reply to them. The Chief Secretary had stated that he re-established the constable on full consideration of the medical certificate from the girl, that the evidence with regard to the constable was equally compatible with his innocence or his guilt, but that the medical officer's certificate constituted fresh evidence on which he felt justified in reinstating him. Sir Antony McDonnell had that further evidence before him when he wrote approving the draft of the letter of dismissal on 23rd January. On the identical evidence on which the Chief Secretary reinstated this man, Sir Antony McDonnell was willing to ruin him for ever. Was it any wonder that a case of this sort should excite suspicion, distress and dismay at Irish government by Sir Antony McDonnell. There was not a parish in Ireland now where a Protestant constable was not walking on peas for fear of annoying the Catholics. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh!"] They had been told that Sir Neville Chamberlain exhibited great gallantry in Afghanistan when he raised the frontier regiments. He should be sorry to say anything reflecting upon the courage of this soldier, but however much he might be a match for the Afghans he was no match for Sir Antony McDonnell. Sir Antony was at the Castle carrying out the behests of the priests and could twist Sir Neville Chamberlain round his finger. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh!"] While Sir Antony McDonnell was at Dublin Castle there was no chance of justice for a Protestant. While scandal after scandal was perpetrated in Ireland in the name of Unionism there would be nothing but prejudice against the cause. The Chief Secretary had on two occasions reversed proceedings in regard to the police, and he appealed to him to give the House some guarantee for the future. All they wanted in Ireland was impartiality, and that was the one thing which while the present Under-Secretary was there they were sure of not getting. Before matters went too far something should be done to avoid the danger of the Ulster Members being returned by their constituents as an independen

Party, absolutely out of touch with the English Unionist Party. This wretched Jonah who kept the whole country in a turmoil to please his own co-religionists should be thrown overboard.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said that the speech of the hon. Member was marred, he thought, by animus against a very distinguished member of the Irish Administration, and he asked for close attention while he dealt very fully with this case. The whole discussion had centred round the case of Constable Anderson, but what was important was that it was stated both by his right hon. and gallant friend and his hon. and learned friend that this case was typical of a policy, a case of mischievous interference by the Under-Secretary in Irish affairs and an interference so mischievous and indefensible as to bring the administration of the country into discredit. That was a very grave charge; and, apart from its general gravity, it was serious from two points o view. It was always a serious matter when it was alleged, and widely believed, that any of His Majesty's subjects had been exposed to judicial or quasi-judicial injustice, and when that subject wore His Majesty's uniform, and there was also involved an aspersion upon a woman, the seriousness was aggravated. It was also a serious matter from the point of view of the discipline of the Royal Irish Constabulary. He could not lay on the Table Departmental communications or the notes taken at the inquiry. These were much fuller than the report in the newspaper which had been referred to; but it was a recognised principle that the House could not, upon the perusal of evidence that they had not heard, re-try any case determined by an appointed tribunal. If he showed grounds for believing that the local commission of inquiry and the Inspector-General acted honestly to the best of their knowledge and belief, and tried to do impartial justice, it was not to be held that he was suggesting any doubt as to the innocence of the constable or as to the virtue of the woman.

Before giving his own version of all that took place, he felt bound to give the representation of the Inspector-General who commanded the Royal Irish Constabulary, who said—

> "I hope you will make it quite clear that this is an attack on the Protestant Inspector-General and not an attack on the Catholic Under-Secretary."

One of the chief points on which the attack in the Anderson case was based was that he was tried and acquitted, and then, at the instigation of the Rev. D. O'Hara, that the Under-Secretary caused him to be tried over again. The Inspector-General put the case in this way—

> "Some time in July, 1903, the Rev. D O'Hara wrote to District-Inspector Shankey making certain complaints against Constable Anderson. Whenever complaints are made against members of the Royal Irish Constabulary, investigations are instituted locally to see if sufficient grounds exist for disciplinary action. This was done. The district inspector did as is usually done in similar cases; he took statements from various people and forwarded them to me. I considered them and came to the conclusion that, though Constable Anderson might have been seen caressing Miss Sweeney, yet as he was engaged to be married to her and such endearments are common to persons in his class of life, there were not sufficient grounds to consider that a man of his previous good character had behaved immorally. It is true that a man named Carr had stated that he had seen them in an immoral position in a wood, but his statement was a vague one and I did not attach any credence to it. I did not believe that Anderson had used obscene language before boys, and it seemed to me very doubtful whether he had entered public-houses when not authorised to do so. I saw no reason to believe Constable Anderson was guilty of what was attributed to him. I recorded this view on the 11th September. When I returned from leave about the 20th October I found the case had assumed a fresh aspect. The county inspector on his own initiative reported on the 9th October that Carr had made a detailed statement as regards the alleged act of immorality. I had made no further move in the matter, as I was on leave, but when I read Carr's statement I felt that in the interests of the force, as well as in Constable Anderson's own interest, it was essential that the matter should be cleared up. I therefore ordered a Court of inquiry to assemble, and as far as I can remember I directed the county inspector to ask the Rev. O'Hara what were the exact charges he desired to prefer against Constable Anderson. He replied that he had no further charges to make in addition to those he had originally made in July. For the Court I selected a Roman Catholic and a Protestant district inspector. As a rule I do not notice what is the religion of the inspectors detailed as members of Courts of inquiry, but in this case I purposely detailed a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, because charges against a Protestant

constable had been made by a Roman Catholic clergyman. The Roman Catholic officer I originally selected was District Inspector Byrne. I then found he was absent on leave, and as it would have caused him great personal expense and inconvenience to return before the completion of his leave, I cancelled the order and appointed District-Inspector W. Hetreed in his place. The latter being police instructor at the depot, where only a few recruits remained, could more easily be spared than an officer in the country."

His hon. and learned friend said that this was without a precedent, but it was not unusual to detail officers from the depot to sit on Courts of inquiry. They could be spared more easily for such duty than officers from the country. It was done in the case of District-Inspector Powell, who was sent to Lusk in 1896, District-Inspector Byrne, sent to Cork in 1901, and District-Inspector Hetreed, sent to Kiltimagh in 1903.

The Inspector-General continues—

"As regards the evidence, I would remark that it was given before two trained police officers who throughout their career have been in the habit of studying the demeanour of witnesses. They are, therefore, in my judgment, far better able to satisfy themselves as regards the credence to be given to any particular witness than members of an ordinary jury. The opinion they recorded was, I have no doubt whatever, given to the best of their conscience. I concurred in the view they expressed and recommended the dismissal of Anderson from the force. I fail to see what cause any one has for complaint. Anderson has been reinstated and has married Bridget Sweeney: yet what reply could you have given in the House if, after the fresh and very grave allegations made to the county inspector on the 9th October, I had failed to make a full and searching inquiry on oath into the case, notwithstanding that I had previously formed the opinion that Anderson was innocent? The reckless and unscrupulous statement in certain newspapers that the confidence of the Royal Irish Constabulary is shaken in the justice they get at headquarters is absurd. I confidently assert that it is untrue and that never in the history of the force were the men more satisfied with the way they are treated than they are now."

The Inspector-General also held that the hon. and learned Gentleman was not justified in saying that certain punishments had never been awarded in such cases.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said that what he had stated was that in a case of seduction, before a constable was dismissed it must be proved in the civil Court that he was in the wrong.

MR. WYNDHAM said that the Inspector-General said that—

"Anderson's case was adjudged to be one of immorality, and he was treated as all similar cases, save one, had been dealt with by me since I assumed command of the force. You will notice that the cases of immorality from 1894 to 1899 averaged 3·46 per annum. In 1900 there was only one case, and in 1901 none. In 1902 however, they recommenced, and in 1903, including Anderson's, there were no less than seven."

And then the Inspector-General directed his attention to a recent judgment given in a civil action for breach of promise of marriage against a sergeant in the force in which Judge Gibson in his charge to the jury at Londonderry, on 18th July, 1903, was reported have said—

"This is the second case where a wrong has been done a girl by a policeman which has come before me within the past few weeks. The first was in Dublin, and now we have another in which this girl was introduced to the fallen sisterhood by a constable stationed at Carrigans, and he has been followed by a sergeant of forty years of age. It is a source of great discomfort and alarm to find that policemen, who should protect the public and farmers' daughters walking along the roads, are found in the ranks of seducers. I do not know whether there is a bad mark in the official records for such an offence, nor do I know whether there is an officer of the police force listening to me. I hope there is, but if there is not, there ought to be. I am not aware whether county inspectors take any steps in their districts to punish men under them who are proved guilty of the offence I have alluded to, or whether the Inspector-General has a general regulation to meet the case. This I do know, that if I had any authority as a police officer, I would at once say to these men 'out you go' from the membership of the force."

He quoted that to show that the Inspector-General was not alone in taking a very serious view of cases of seduction when they were shown to have been committed. It was not wise to deal with these investigations as if they were Courts of law They were, in fact, councils to assist an officer, who had a perfect right to act as he pleased. Any man who went into a disciplined force sacrificed a good deal. He had to accept limitations on his liberty, he was subject to penalties for offences which were not crimes against the law, and he had to acquiesce in the right of the Crown to dispense with his services at any moment without assigning any cause or reason whatever. That the right of the Crown was not waived by the Court of inquiry, which was not a judicial tribunal, was founded on a judgment of Chief Justice Dallas in the case of "Home *v.* Bentinck" in 1820. Dealing with the report of a Court of inquiry, the Chief Justice said—

> "What was this report, in its very nature, but a confidential communication, in consequence of a direction by the Commander-in-Chief, for the information of his own conscience in the exercise of his public duty, as to whether he would suffer the plaintiff to continue an officer or not, in a case in which it must be agreed and admitted that, independent of any inquiry whatever, His Majesty in the exercise of his prerogative might have dismissed him at any time."

That was the law about a Court of inquiry in a disciplined force. Any man who entered any such a force of his own knowledge, exposed himself to that risk. Therefore it rested with the Crown to dispense with the services of a man on suspicion or because he could no longer do his duty with benefit to the corps to which he belonged. But, although that power was unqualified and unconditional, it must be exercised with discretion and without undue severity, and if it could be shown in any case that that power of dismissal on the finding of a Court of inquiry had been exercised without discretion or with undue severity, then, of course, the Minister of the Department in which that had happened might very well be called to account. On the other hand, if he could show—and that was what he had to prove—that the action of the Executive Minister and of the deputies and officers for whom he was responsible had not been wrongfully influenced by persons acting on improper motives, then he thought that power revived in full force. It might have been erroneously exercised, but if it could be shown that it had been honestly and faithfully exercised, and not wrongfully influenced by other persons, then he thought the House could not bring in a true bill against the Minister or officer concerned. His case was that the action of nobody was influenced at all up to 9th October and that after that date it was not wrongfully influenced The whole case against the Governmen. was that Father O'Hara intervened to influence the Under-Secretary, who influenced the Inspector-General. If he could show that nobody entered on the scene except the local officials up to a certain date, that all was done by them without reference to headquarters, and that when the authorities at headquarters of the Royal Irish Constabulary took action they were not wrongfully influenced, then he thought he ought to be able to claim a verdict.

The offence was alleged to have taken place on 24th June, but nothing of which he had any knowledge occurred until 26th July, when Father O'Hara undoubtedly wrote to the district inspector with a complaint, and the district inspector referred the matter, not to headquarters, but to the county inspector.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Of what did Father O'Hara complain?

MR. WYNDHAM said that Father O'Hara accused Anderson of using improper language before boys, and also said that two married men in his parish had complained to him that Anderson had been seen walking with a girl in byroads and woods. He said that this caused scandal, and asked that Anderson should be transferred from his parish. He did not then, or at any subsequent period, ask that Anderson should be punished. If this representation had no effect on the action of the local officer and did not reach headquarters, how could the motives charged be brought into the matter in order to create prejudice against the Under-Secretary? He would like to say a word about motives. It was assumed all through that Father O'Hara and others locally had a grudge against this man because he was a Protestant. That was a mere assumption, incapable of proof or disproof. It was a surmise, and a surmise which was not made at the time. The district inspector, who, he thought, had acted very properly and wisely throughout these transactions, when he referred the letter to the county inspector, said the animus of the rev. writer against the constable had no spontaneous origin, but the rev. gentleman was being used as an instrument by others to procure the constable's dismissal. That was a mere surmise. The district inspector at a later date said these charges were brought nominally by Father O'Hara but virtually at the instance of others. That was another surmise. In this village there was sure to be a lot of gossip and surmise and some ill-will against a man based upon reasons that might have no reality. Constable Anderson himself made a statement when denying the charges. He declared that the Carr family had a grudge against the Sweeney family, and that he had no doubt that the charges were made in order to get him transferred because he had been doing his duty under the licensing laws. That was another surmise. Constable Anderson never suggested he was unpopular because he was a Protestant. That surmise was advanced later. But no one of these surmises affected the action of the police authorities. County Inspector Brooke, when this kind of talk was brought to him, saw no reason for removing the constable. That was the view of the county inspector on 10th August. Then these complaints were made, and the district inspector was directed (not by headquarters) to hear what complaint this clergyman had to make and to take down the stories the people had to tell. That he did, and this inquiry was held, but that was not a legal tribunal. Could it be said that the local police, after hearing these complaints and taking down the statements of Tom, Dick and Harry, and then sending them to the County Inspector with the remark, "I don't think there is much in this," was a trial in a court of law? The county inspector, who on the 10th August pooh-poohed the whole affair, was away on leave and another district inspector was acting in his absence. He saw that written complaint and said that Constable Anderson should not be called upon to plead to the charges, but should be afforded an opportunity of making an explanation of the various matters alleged. Anderson made his explanation denying everything, and said the charges had been brought against him because he was unpopular through enforcing the licensing law rather strictly. On the 24th August the acting county inspector informed the district inspector that the papers disclosed nothing to justify these charges, but that, if he was of opinion that Anderson was guilty, he should be called upon to plead.

There was quite another matter relating to some story of an alleged threatening letter which came into the case but which had nothing to do with it. Because of this the papers were sent to headquarters on 5th September for the first time, and that was the first contact between the little local trouble and headquarters. The Acting Inspector-General, acting under the instructions of the Inspector-General received this document and confirmed the report of the county inspector that there was not sufficient ground for action. He said, however, that if Anderson desired a Court of inquiry he would consent to one. Here there was therefore, on the 5th September, a local complaint which would not have gone to headquarters but for this irrelevant matter of an alleged threatening letter. And now they had to come to the crucial point which he had to make good. All parties were waiting for the county inspector to come back. The county inspector came back and he evidently saw the rev. O'Hara. The rev. Father O'Hara complained that sufficient consideration had not been given to the statements of Carr. That Carr swore that he saw certain things going on and that sufficient consideration was not given to this statement. On the 9th October the county inspector wrote that he had had an interview with Carr, and that the impression he got was that there could be no doubt that Anderson was having immoral intercourse with a girl when seen by Carr.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE: The county inspector wrote to headquarters a letter, which contained this paragraph, "I have now seen Carr." Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us why he wrote to the Inspector-General and said that?

MR. WYNDHAM said reference was made to a statement in a letter of Father O'Hara that Carr had sworn so and so. That letter was sent up to the Castle—he meant the headquarters of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and it did not come before Sir A. McDonnell. The county inspector, on the 10th August, had said there was nothing in the matter at all. He was the person who said he thought Anderson was the victim of persecution, and therefore it could not be said that he was prejudiced. Having seen this man and heard his story he reported that it was a grave matter. Then the Assistant Inspector-General concurs and states that the county inspector's report renders it necessary that the Papers should be laid before the Inspector-General on his return from leave. On 21st October, the Inspector-General, having returned, informed the county inspector that his report of the 9th altered the aspect of the case and in the interest of both the constable and the public and rendered further inquiry necessary. He did not pronounce whether that was right or wrong—he himself thought it was right—but supposing it was wrong there was no ground on which there could be any suggestion that Sir Antony McDonnell had anything to do with it. The Inspector-General appointed the District Inspector of Athlone to hold the inquiry, and for the reasons he had given also appointed Inspector Hetreed to be present and preside. His hon. and learned friend said that Father O'Hara spoke to the Under-Secretary at the Congested Districts Board. But all this happened before then, and, although a great deal has been said as to that, it was really impossible to make anything of what occurred at the Congested Districts Board. Father O'Hara informed the Under-Secretary that there was trouble in his parish over the conduct of a constable, the Under-Secretary said, "Why don't you speak to his sergeant?" Father O'Hara replied that he had, but without effect, and asked the Under-Secretary to inquire into the matter. This the Under-Secretary did, and on communicating with the constabulary authorities was informed that an inquiry was progressing. If his hon. and learned friend had been a member of the Congested Districts Board what would he have done? He thought he would have done the same thing. He knew he should. Did the hon. and leraned Member and the right hon. Member think that the Rev. Father O'Hara was the only person who complained to the Government? They must know that on one occasion or another innumerable letters come, and it was not a matter of surprise, in respect to the Royal Irish Constabulary, where they had a force of 9,000 men with their officers quartered throughout the country, that letters should come and complaints be made. Did the hon. and learned Gentleman really suppose that nobody ever suggested they would sooner have this officer than that in this or that town? All that could be done in these matters was to sift a good deal of these letters aside as rubbish, but where a serious person sent a complaint and seemed to have something on his mind, then to send his complaint to the proper quarter. Sir Antony McDonnell asked him to say that Father O'Hara did speak to him at the Congested Districts Board, and he had stated that in reply to the hon. and learned Member. But for Sir Anthony McDonnell's request he would not have made the statement, which was quite irrelevant to the charge that Sir Anthony McDonnell had influenced the police authorities. He had not influenced them.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could fix the date on which Father O'Hara spoke to Sir Antony McDonnell.

Mr. WYNDHAM said he thought he could look up the papers.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE said the date was most important.

Mr. WYNDHAM said he thought he had made out his case, and if the hon. and learned Gentleman did not think so he was afraid he never should be able to justify himself in his eyes.

Mr. WALLACE (Perth) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would object to tell them in what it was that the second statement of Carr differed from the first, which led to this change of opinion.

Mr. WYNDHAM said the county inspector did not see the first statement. The first statement was given to the inspector who did duty for him. That first statement eventually went up to headquarters, and, as he said, the Inspector-General himself thought it too vague. It was said in the first statement that there were improper relations or something of that kind, and he must confess it would not have impressed him very much. What Carr said to County Inspector Brooke verbally no one could tell, but the impression he created was that immoral intercourse was actually taking place and it was because of that impression that County Inspector Brooke took the view he did and the Inspector-General had the Court of inquiry. As he had said, that House was not competent to re-try a case tried before a judicial tribunal, still less could they re-try a case which was taken before a Court of inquiry, and where there was no verbatim report. How absurd it would be to say, on the newspaper reports, that these two officers had taken any action which they ought not to have taken? This witness was examined and cross-examined by them, and they came to the conclusion that he evidently believed that there were improper relations going on between these two.

Now the charge came against him. Why, if that was the case, did he put Constable Anderson back? The right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh came to him one day and said here was a man who had been tried twice, acquitted once, and who was now condemned, and he did not think he had been treated fairly. He replied that his right hon. friend must have been misled. Somewhat similar statements reached him from other quarters simultaneously. He looked into the case as he would have done if any serious person had come to him and said that any man was not being treated justly. What other course should he have taken? He remembered perfectly well it was in the month of February and he at once wrote to the Inspector-General on the subject. He went through the full evidence and noted that subsequent to the dismissal of the constable Miss Sweeny had submitted herself to an examination by two Dublin doctors who certified that she was a *virgo intacta.* This certificate was forwarded to the Inspector-General by the constable's solicitor, but as the Inspector-General conceived the offence to have been an attempt at seduction he replied that the new evidence did not alter his decision in dismissing the man. He was very unwilling, for the sake of discipline, to put the man back unless he carried the Inspector-General with him. He confessed that he himself, without hearing the examination and cross-examination of witnesses, should have been slow to believe, having regard to the fact that the constable was walking out with this young lady, that he was necessarily attempting seduction, but those who heard all the evidence came to another conclusion, and it was not for him who had not heard it to suggest that they were wrong. He merely submitted the fact that there was this certificate to his legal advisers, and they convinced him that that threw back a perfectly fresh light on the case, and that if it had been before the Court it would have been the duty of whoever defended Anderson to ask the Court to consider all the evidence in the light of the certificate. It must be remembered that the alleged offence took place in the beginning of June, and that no notice was taken of the complaint for weeks, and when it was taken the man was exonerated by his superior officers, and he was left free to walk, as he did walk, with this young lady; and when months afterwards, there having been every opportunity, it was certified that there was nothing against the honour and virtue of this young lady, it did throw an entirely fresh light upon the case. A truthful witness might have seen what might have been a very compromising position, but it was not for them to look into the relations between two people who were engaged and were now married. He regretted very much for the honour of the girl, who was married honourably to the man, that this matter should have been debated, and he hoped the rest of their lives would not be troubled by anything of the kind. But if this was the best case that could be brought forward to show that Sir Antony Macdonnell was interfering illegitimately with the administration of departments in the government of Ireland, and was carrying out a policy that was not his policy, he did not think it was a very strong one. This was a case of police discipline dealt with first locally and then at the Head Quarters of the Royal Irish Constabulary upon which Sir Antony McDonnell exercised no influence.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) said that if it had not been for the action of his hon. friend the Member for Mid-Armagh in approaching the Chief Secretary, it was beyond all doubt that Constable Anderson, would have been the victim of an avowed conspiracy, whether on the part of the Rev. D. O'Hara or of his accomplices, would have suffered a gross injustice which would have been a disgrace to Irish administration. No matter how the Chief Secretary tried to wriggle out of the matter, the responsibility belonged to him. He could not accept the view of the right hon. Gentleman that the men in the Royal Irish Constabulary force had complete confidence in the powers above them. If such implicit confidence existed, there would not have been so many grave complaints against the disciplinary power. It was a scandal that one man in the South-West of Ireland, who happened to be a Protestant, should be left isolated to become the victim of an avowed conspiracy. In the case of the Rev. Dixon Patterson, who was unable to walk through the streets of Dublin without being insulted, the Chief Secretary, in reply to a Question, stated that no complaints had been made. On receiving a detailed statement, however, he had to admit the facts of the case, and said that the police were doing all in their power to do justice to the Protestants of Dublin. But on 26th July, that clergyman had to bring five or six youths before a magistrate, by whom they were fined, and yet that very magistrate declared the evidence given by the clergyman to be unwarrantable and utterly untrue. He submitted that that was not the way in which the law ought to be administered.

The debate had shown that it was well worth while for the chairman of the Ulster Unionist Party to bring this case before the House, but he could not admit that the defence of the Castle by the Chief Secretary had been such as to entitle it to the confidence of Ulster Unionist Members. In view of the fact that the Press was teeming with letters from Protestants of all denominations complaining of the insults to which they were subjected when passing through the streets, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the advisability of instituting a further inquiry into the particular case which he had mentioned, and if he found there had been another miscarriage of justice or that base insinuations had emanated from the Catholic Association against a Protestant clergyman, of calling upon the magistrate for a withdrawal of his statement.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that this was a matter of the gravest importance to Irish Loyalists and to the country generally. Altogether apart from the merits of the particular case now under review, and judging by the other cases with which the Under-Secretary was connected there could be little doubt that Sir Antony McDonnell's sympathies lay entirely with his fellow-religionists and were as entirely against the interests of the Loyalists in the North. Four notorious cases in which Sir Antony McDonnell was concerned had been brought to the notice of the House, and with two of them the rev. Denis O'Hara was connected. The sending to Father Gleeson of the evidence of the prosecution in the case of the two constables in Connemara was a disgraceful act on the part of Sir Antony McDonnell. Father Gleeson was the man who had set the law in motion against these men, and why should the evidence be sent to him for consideration and annotation? No proceeding could be more extraordinary upon the part of a responsible executive officer than the sending of confidential documents to a parish priest who had no claim whatever to see them. It might be noticed that while the Chief Secretary refused to lay Papers on the Table of this House on account of their confidential and Departmental character, no such considerations weighed with the Under-Secretary when the person desired to see the Papers was a parish priest. The strength of the case of the Irish Loyalists lay in the fact that in all four of the instances put forward Sir Antony McDonnell had interfered in a manner that was utterly unprecedented. The Under-Secretary was a purely executive officer, whose sole duty was to carry out the orders of those above him, the person responsible being the Chief Secretary, who was supposed to issue the orders. Unfortunately, Sir Antony McDonnell, apparently with the consent of the Chief Secretary, had arrogated to himself the entire direction of Irish affairs. He thought all fair-minded men would agree that in the Anderson case Sir Antony

McDonnell interfered in a way he should not have done.

AN IRISH MEMBER: The Chief Secretary, who is your leader, denies that.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the Chief Secretary was not their leader at present, and in anything the right hon. Gentleman had said he had not to his mind furnished a proper refutation of the charges brought against Sir Antony McDonnell. The right hon. Gentleman had not been very clear with regard to the accusations really brought against Constable Anderson. At one time they were said to involve a charge of seduction, but that charge had never been tried.

MR. WYNDHAM said these Courts were appointed to advise the Inspector-General, and not really to try cases. Much inconvenience attached to the fact that these Courts, which were merely advisory boards, had a procedure so much like that of a true Court. That was a matter he intended to consider with the Inspector-General. It was far better that the decision should be given in the nature of a report rather than in the nature of a verdict. He believed the charge in this case was that of grossly immoral conduct.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that whatever might have been the charge it was clearly proved at the trial that there had been no seduction, and the punishment of dismissal from the force after seventeen years service was absolutely unknown in such a case. He submitted that to inflict so heavy a punishment in a case of so doubtful a character was grossly unfair. That view was really upborne by the Chief Secretary, because no sooner did the right hon. Gentleman look into the case than he determined that a gross injustice had been perpetrated, and that the man must be reinstated in the force. The cases which had been brought forward revealed a state of things which could not be allowed to go on. If the Irish Administration was to be respected by that portion of the inhabitants of Ireland who lived in the North, this state of affairs must cease. Sir Antony McDonnell must see his way to occupying his position as Under-Secretary in the way in which it was intended to be occupied. That position was under the Chief Secretary, and he was intended to carry out the behests and the policy of the right hon. Gentleman, and not to initiate a policy which was distasteful and repugnant to a large section of the community. The feeling had been growing for some time that the policy of the Government was the policy of Sir Antony McDonnell, and that his was that of the Roman Catholic Association. He thought he might read a short extract from the Handbook of the Catholic Association which would enable the Committee to recognise that the system of approaching Sir Antony McDonnell by every petty parish priest throughout the country was simply carrying out the instructions of the association—

> "Let the reader conceive to himself an organisation, with an intelligent centre in the capital; with branches spreading everywhere through the country, and the facilities for easy and intimate communication between the guiding head of the body and the members of branches. Let him picture to himself ubiquitous activity and the constant flow of streams of information and helpful suggestion between headquarters and the provinces; let him conceive all this aided, when needful, by private personal despatches and the use of a telegraphic code for expedition and privacy, and he will have before his mind's eye some faint image of what a well planned organisation — alert, alive, and at work — might mean for Ireland."

He need not read more. He thought that exactly described the state of affairs which existed at the present moment with respect to Sir Antony McDonnell in Ireland. He had read that extract in order to enable the Committee to judge whether his hon. friends and himself had used exaggerated language, or language which in any way was inconsistent with a reasonable view of the facts. He hoped that the Chief Secretary, in replying to the supplementary criticisms made since he spoke, would be able to give some promise that the state of things of which they complained would not continue.

MR. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) said that nothing had carried such strong conviction to his mind in regard to the position his friends and himself had taken up in the Anderson case as the speech of the Chief Secretary. He would ask the question—Why did Father O'Hara go to

Sir Antony McDonnell? He knew perfectly well that the only way in which a constable could be got rid of was by an order issued by high authority. And so he went to the Under-Secretary. Why did he not go to the Inspector-General? In the interval between the report of the district inspector and its approval by the acting county inspector and Inspector-General, they would find that Father O'Hara discussed the matter with Sir Antony McDonnell. The Inspector-General, in his statement, did not say that Sir Antony McDonnell did not discuss the matter with him. If they did what right had they to discuss the character of a man who had nothing but good conduct to his credit, and who, when the charge was made against him, was acquitted of it. It was very easy to say that the whole inquiry was one of routine, but it should be remembered they were dealing with a man with seventeen years service in the force, and depriving him of his means of living. They gave the Chief Secretary every wish to cover up anything done by his subordinates, but they could not be blind to the obvious facts of the case. What was the result? This man was dealt with with all the rigour applied to cases which had been substantiated in Courts of justice. It was all very easy to say that this was merely routine in dealing with a disciplined force. But in this case the life of a man who had had an unblemished record for seventeen years was being dealt with. He was being deprived of his means of livelihood, apart altogether from what this poor girl had had to submit to. The moment the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had the facts before him he reinstated the man. He would give the right hon. Gentleman credit for the feeling which dictated to him a desire to cover up anything that had been done by his subordinates; but he ventured to say that there had never been any case, after the certificates of the doctors had been produced, against this man, and that Anderson was not guilty of any offence known to the law. He thought that the House ought to mark its strong sense of the wrong perpetrated in the case of Constable Anderson, by voting in favour of this Motion.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said that the debate had left an extremely disagreeable impression upon the minds of impartial men on both sides of the House. What were the facts of the case? A Protestant constable of good character became engaged to be married to a Roman Catholic young lady. From that point onwards a network of conspiracy was gradually drawn around him, supported by this priest O'Hara. Unfortunately, owing to the influence of Sir Antony McDonnell, the constable after long years of good service was dismissed from the force, and the young lady subjected to a stigma. But for the action of several of the Ulster Members this unfortunate man would have had a ruined life, and the unfortunate young lady would have remained under a wrong imputation. The Chief Secretary in his ingenious speech had appealed to Ulster Members for their continued confidence. Until he resisted the sinister influence that surrounded him in Dublin, he would forfeit the confidence of the Party that had always been in the past among the most loyal and faithful supporters of the Unionist cause.

*SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said he knew this case had excited much feeling in the minds of many people not only in Ireland but in England. The only reason why he intervened, and that for a moment, in an Irish debate was to do what he would like another man to do for him were he concerned in such a matter. It would take a great deal to make him believe that a man with such antecedents as the present Under-Secretary for Ireland would be guilty of such conduct as had been attributed to him, that he had been influenced by sectarian feeling, and that he had done other than simple justice in a case which was brought before him. A man who had obtained a place so high in the Indian service by his own talents, industry, and merit—and many had expected that he would rise even higher—a man of his immense administrative capacity, could not be rightly accused of partiality or injustice. It was not inappropriate that a distinguished official should be selected for high employment in Ireland who belonged to the religion of the great majority. He trusted

Sir Antony McDonnell would not think for a moment that he had in any degree laboured under the imputation before this House of any failure in his duties, which all who knew him knew him to be incapable of.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that so far as the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down was concerned he really thought that Sir Antony McDonnell required no defence in this case at all. The Chief Secretary had entirely demolished the case made against him, and he thought if one could penetrate into Sir Antony McDonnell's breast and discover what his feeling was on this subject one would find that he was animated by supreme indifference to the attacks levelled against him in this debate. No impartial man who had listened to the speech of the Chief Secretary could have any doubt that these accusations, one and all, were absolutely without foundation. That being so, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh might be surprised when he said that he intended to vote for his Motion. His reasons were entirely different from those of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. He complained that a certain respectable clergyman in the West of Ireland had been able to go and use an illegitimate influence with the Government to get a man prosecuted for a false charge. He (Mr. Redmond) would not go into that question at all, but his charge against the Chief Secretary was, that a competent tribunal having received sworn evidence, having considered this charge, having come to a decision unfavourable to the man and having convicted him on it, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was able to go behind the Speaker's Chair into the Chief Secretary's room, to exercise an illegitimate influence on him, and to get the decision of a perfectly competent tribunal arrived at on sworn evidence overturned by the Executive action of the right hon. Gentleman acting alone.

AN HON. MEMBER: Even though the man was innocent.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he would be very glad to believe this man innocent, but he had no means of knowing. What ought to happen in this case was that there ought to be a full inquiry into the whole facts. It was a very remarkable thing that when this case began to be spoken of in the public Press, when in this country and in Ireland efforts were set on foot to arouse evil passions and religious bitterness over this question, and when there was a unanimous chorus demanding a full inquiry into all the facts of the case, as had been put forward with great vehemence by the *Globe* and the *Daily Mail* and the *Irish Times*; yet suddenly the demand had been allowed to drop, and not one of the hon. Gentlemen opposite made any demand for an inquiry.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: We do not object in the least to an inquiry.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that he gathered the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would rather like an inquiry, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman and his friends would press on his friends the necessity for an inquiry into this case. The whole allegation was that there was something hidden in this matter, and that when the truth was known it would be something very disgraceful to Canon O'Hara, Sir Antony McDonnell, and the Catholic body in Ireland generally. If there was any real belief in the charge let it be put to the test. Let them have an inquiry into this matter. The charge was a very serious one, concerning practically the whole Catholic body in Ireland, a very respectable clergyman, and members of the Government. The most disgraceful charges had been made, and he asked for a public inquiry into those charges. He thought it was a pretty good test of the real measure of belief which hon. Gentlemen had had in the truth of their own accusations that they had not said a word about inquiry until he spoke, and then, after all, what they said was that they had no objection. Why had they dropped this demand for an inquiry? He declined altogether to go into the merits of this case. He confined himself entirely to this demand for an inquiry, because he believed that the Chief Secretary had been guilty of a most improper decision in overriding the decision of a competent tribunal, taken on evidence on oath, and because he thought his refusal of an inquiry was nothing less than an outrage. For that reason he and his friends would vote against the Chief Secretary's salary that night, even if they had no other reason, and for these reasons they would vote in favour of the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Gentleman who, he hoped, before the debate ended, would rise and enforce his demand for an inquiry.

*Mr. LONSDALE said he had intervened in this discussion in order to call attention to a matter which closely concerned the county of Armagh; and which was also of great interest and importance to the whole of Ulster. He alluded to the strange method which the Irish Government had recently adopted of dealing with what was known as the extra police tax—that was to say, the charges which were levied by the Government upon local authorities for the occasional services of additional police. It would be within the knowledge of some members of the Committee that during the last few months the Government had remitted this extra police tax in the case of nine counties, while they had refused to make similar remissions in the case of other counties in the North of Ireland.

Mr. MACVEAGH asked whether the hon. Gentleman was in order in raising that question on the Vote for the Chief Secretary's salary, seeing that there was a separate Vote for the police?

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN ruled that details could not be discussed, as there was a separate Vote for the police; but the hon. Gentleman was in order in referring to the policy of the Chief Secretary in the matter.

*Mr. LONSDALE said the counties in which remissions had been made were Cavan, Clare, Fermanagh, Galway, Leitrim, Roscommon, Sligo, Tipperary, and Waterford; they were all Nationalist counties, and the total amount which had been remitted was £7,400. While the Government had relieved those Nationalist districts from payment of this tax, they had refused to afford any relief

to the counties of Armagh, Down, and the city of Londonderry. He contended, therefore, that in this matter the Government had discriminated between Irish counties in such a way as to inflict serious injustice upon the loyal and law-abiding section of the Irish people. He did not assert that his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary had any intention of favouring one section at the expense of another, but he pointed out that the action of the Executive had unquestionably produced that effect and that the right hon. Gentleman was responsible for what had been done. His charge against the Government was that their new policy of concession and conciliation was being carried out with an utter disregard of the just claims of Ulster. In their anxiety to be generous to their opponents the Government had forgotten to be just to their own supporters. This mistaken policy was producing the result which might have been expected. On the one hand, it had failed to reconcile hon. Members opposite and their supporters, who declared as vehemently as ever that no concession would turn them from their agitation for Home Rule. On the other hand, this policy was estranging those whose loyalty to the Constitution had been the main barrier against separation.

The people of Ulster were, to-day, smarting under a keen sense of wrong, and he warned his right hon. friend that there existed a widespread feeling of indignation against the present Irish administration. He would like to recall to the memory of his right hon. friend what he said in that House two years ago. At that time intimidation and boycotting were prevalent in many parts of Ireland, and it became necessary to take strong measures to put a stop to those criminal practices. His right hon. friend assured the House that his policy was not to kill Home Rule with kindness—but to "kill crime with common sense." One of the "common-sense" methods he adopted was to send additional police into disturbed districts and charge half the cost of those police against the counties concerned. That was a very sensible arrangement. It was in every way proper that those who called the tune should pay the piper.

Clearly the object of his right hon. friend was to teach the people that lawlessness was an expensive luxury. At the same time, the right hon. Gentleman wished to give those who were being oppressed confidence in the determination of the Government to protect them. But what really happened? The theory was excellent; but in practice it did not work. The payment of these charges for additional police was resisted. Sligo led the way. Sligo was the largest debtor. Last autumn the bill of the Government against Sligo for extra police amounted to £2,323. It was to be presumed that the extra police were not sent into Sligo without cause; and that the reason this county had more to pay than others was because there had been a greater amount of disorder in Sligo than in other places. But Sligo would not pay the Government demand. No doubt Sligo was strengthened in that determination by the example of the city of Limerick, which had not paid any tax for extra police for more than twenty years. The Sligo people found the Castle authorities in a yielding humour, and their surprise when they were told the charge would not be pressed could be imagined. The success of Sligo naturally encouraged other counties to agitate for similar treatment; and the Government surrendered their claims in case after case. These concessions, however, were confined to Nationalist counties in the South and West. The official reason given for this change of front was wholly unconvincing. In reply to a Question on the 24th March, the Chief Secretary stated that—

> "The claim made against Sligo was in respect of a reserve force of Constabulary, and when it subsequently transpired that the additional men had not been drawn from the reserve, which is located by statute at the depôt in Dublin—but had been drafted from other counties—the Government was advised that there was no legal power to recover the claim."

That was to say—the Government having surrendered to clamour, now tried to shelter themselves behind a confession of incompetence. Somebody, it seemed, had blundered. The weak point about this explanation was that the "blunder" affected only Nationalist counties. In those counties, of course, the abandonment of the charges had naturally been hailed as a "victory for agitation," and that seemed to be the proper description to apply to it. But the Chief Secretary could not be surprised if the favour shown by Dublin Castle towards a section of the Irish people, at the expense of the taxpayer, should have led to an outcry from Ulster against the unfairness of the whole proceeding. The county council of Armagh had claimed that that county should be also relieved from payment of the extra police tax. Similar claims had been made by the counties of Tyrone and Down and Londonderry city. Their demands were the natural consequence of the concessions made to the Nationalist counties, and he submitted that they were based upon reason and justice. His constituents in Armagh rightly contended that the effect of the remission of £7,400 in the counties he had named was to place an additional burden upon them. This £7,400 had to be met out of the general taxation funds to which, of course, Armagh contributed its share. It was manifestly unjust that while this extra expense was placed upon Armagh, the county should still be expected to pay its own charges for special police. In the case of Armagh the amount immediately in dispute was not large, but the principle at stake was one of considerable importance. During the last ten years, Armagh had paid a total of £2,663 for extra police; and he maintained that the county had a good claim for the return of a part of this money, if not the whole of it, especially as some of it seemed to have been quite unnecessary expenditure. They based their claim for remission mainly upon the broad ground that there should be equality of treatment as between one county and another, in this and in all other matters. If these police charges were remitted in one case they should be remitted in all.

He would doubtless be told that the case of Armagh was different from the case of Sligo and the other counties favoured by the Government, but he was unable to discover any difference which would justify a difference of treatment. To his mind the so-called dissimilarity was like the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. It was absolutely undetectable by the eye of common sense. His right hon. friend had relied upon the fact that in Sligo the extra police were not drawn from the Reserve Depot in Dublin, but from other adjoining counties. That was also the case in Armagh. In that respect the two cases were absolutely similar, and it followed that if Sligo was relieved on that ground, Armagh had the right to claim similar treatment. To contend that a difference should be made because in one case the police were sent under one Act of Parliament, and in the other case under another Act of Parliament, seemed to him to be quite beside the point. The question still remained, why should police be sent into Sligo under one law and into Armagh under another? There seemed to be a perfect maze of Acts of Parliament dealing with this matter. The advisers of the Chief Secretary, by their own confession, lost themselves in this maze, and at last stumbled upon a reason for relieving nine Irish counties from the tax. He suggested that they should make a further exploration. They would then discover a flaw in the claim against Armagh and the other counties in the North of Ireland which would enable the charges to be remitted in those cases also. In any case, they who represented Ulster constituencies felt bound to protest as strongly as they could against what they regarded as the unfair treatment of Ulster. They were not only refused equality of treatment, but the effect of the action of the Government was to impose upon loyal and law-abiding people a double share of the cost of repressing disorder. That was most unfair. He submitted that they were justified in their protest; and should receive the support of all Unionists in this Committee in their demand that in this, and in all other respects, there should be equal treatment for all.

MR. WYNDHAM said the charge now brought against the Government was that in order to carry out a policy of conciliation they had remitted taxes in Nationalist counties and refused to remit corresponding charges in counties returning Unionist Members. When the resolution was sent to him by the Unionist Members he dealt with that charge in a very long letter, and showed that it was impossible to collect the money in the particular places in which the tax had been remitted. The resolution was published, but not his reply, which he thought was a pity. It was clear that Sir A. McDonnell was not concerned in this matter, as the mistake was made long before his appointment. When endeavouring to deal with disorder in Ireland he directed that extra police should be sent into the disturbed districts, and that the charge should be placed upon the counties concerned. That could be done only under two sets of Acts, and the extra police had to be really extra police, they had to be sent from the depot. Owing to a blunder, the police, instead of being sent from the depot at Dublin, were sent from an adjoining part of the same county. The debt was therefore irrecoverable, otherwise the people would have been paying for the police twice over. They would be paying for the police of the county, and obviously if the men were simply transferred from one part of the county to another they could not be charged again for the same men; they were not extra police at all.

MR. SLOAN: Who discovered the blunder?

MR. WYNDHAM said the blunder was discovered by his legal advisers, who went through the Acts of Parliament and told him that he could not recover the money. That being so, would anybody suggest that he ought to have gone on trying to recover the money illegally, with the absolute certitude that the Government would be brought before the High Court and cast in damages?

*MR. LONSDALE asked whether the right hon. Gentleman contended that those conditions applied in all the nine counties in which the police tax had been remitted. The city of Limerick had paid no police tax for twenty years!

MR. WYNDHAM submitted that when the Law Officers advised that a particular tax could not be recovered it was not the duty of the Government to go and break the law. He was not anxious to lose this £7,000. The money would have come in very handy, and he parted with it with the greatest regret after exercising the ingenuity of his legal advisers to the utmost to see whether he could not in some way collect it. It was unfortunately true that the disorder was almost entirely, if not entirely, in counties returning Nationalist Members to Parliament, but his hon. friends could hardly suggest that they had a grievance, and that charges in their counties that were legal and could be collected should also be remitted. No Minister could adopt such a policy as that. A cardinal feature of the case had been left untouched, viz., that in a large number of Nationalist counties the police tax had not been remitted. The amount remitted was doubtless a large sum, but the Committee should bear in mind that it had not been remitted in Cork City, in Fermanagh, Kildare, King's county, Leitrim, Longford, Roscommon, Sligo, Tipperary, or Waterford. In those cases the amounts were legally requisitioned, and, as they could therefore be sued for, he was suing for them. There had been no disparity of treatment, and he really thought his hon. friends ought not to bring charges of unfair treatment against the Government upon such a slight foundation.

With regard to the Anderson case, he thought some of those who had spoken after him had done scant justice to what he had placed before the Committee. He had proved successfully that Sir Antony McDonnell had nothing to say in the matter at all. His right hon. and gallant friend had said he took a pessimistic view of his Irish administration because of the appointments that he had made. But of the three appointments to which his right hon. and gallant friend referred, one was made before he took office. With reference to Mr. Finucane he was glad to hear no suggestion from his right hon. and gallant friend that the appointment was not a proper one. It was true that he recommended the appointment of Sir Antony McDonnell. He was proud of having made that recommendation. Before he knew there was likely to be a vacancy in the Under-Secretaryship he had met Sir Antony McDonnell, and from what he heard from Lord Lansdowne at the time, and from Lord Curzon since, and from what he knew of him himself, he was convinced that there was no public servant who less deserved to be attacked as Sir Antony McDonnell had been attacked that afternoon. Was it not distressing that these charges should be made against a public servant who had covered himself with such distinction in India, who before being appointed to this office was summoned to be a Privy Councillor, and who was admitted to the Privy Council at the same time as himself. Was he to be silent when charges were made against that eminent servant of the King and of the Empire—charges for which there was no justification, and which rested upon no foundation of any kind at all?

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh brought forward another matter. In Ireland they had from time to time a good deal of trouble about the hanging out of flags and bunting at various celebrations. This was familiar to anyone who knew anything of Irish life. Because of these difficulties the law said that flags were not to be hung out by the owners of licensed premises. In practice, and he believed legally, the law had been interpreted to mean that Party emblems were not to be hung up. This, he believed, was sound law, and he was sure it was sound sense; otherwise they would have to pull down the Royal Standard or the Union Jack in order to prevent the law being broken. The police were warned not to pull down Union Jacks or flags of that kind but to report any doubtful point to their authority before acting. A complaint was made by the Rev. Mr. Gleeson that two policemen had objected to the display of flags at a public-house. That complaint was sent without comment to the Inspector-General, and he sent it down to the district inspector there. The district inspector made a mistake. Instead of sending at once for the men, and asking why they did not go to him for instructions, he went to all the publicans, and having seen all of them, he found that one only had been addressed by these two constables. The error, and the only error, was that, without seeing the policemen, the district inspector reported that, in his opinion, it was imprudent to discuss the matter at all. The county inspector passed that on, and endorsed it to the Inspector-General. This was the whole case. The right hon. Gentleman asked why Sir A. McDonnell came in. He came in because the Rev. William Gleeson persisted in his complaint, and kept on writing, and saying that he had been badly used because no notice had been taken of the complaint. Sir A. McDonnell then answered and stated very fully what had been done; and he himself could not say that was any mistake. It might be said that it was better not to answer letters. This would make their work a great deal easier than it was. But, in his opinion, it was the duty of a Government Department to send detailed replies to show why the Government had not taken certain action which they were asked to take. The acknowledgement of correspondence was not a fault that should be charged against a public administrator.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said he quite agreed with what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, but it was very hard indeed that a public servant in the position of Sir Antony Mcdonnell should be subjected to the charge which had been stated so broadly by some hon. and right hon. Members. It occurred to him that there should be an inquiry into the whole of this case. He thought that what had taken place reflected not only on the character of the individual, but also more or less on the administration of the law in Ireland. He did not offer any opinion one way or another upon the conduct of Constable Anderson, but they had the fact that he was condemned by a Court of inquiry and that he was dismissed. It was a very strong measure for the Chief Secretary, *ex proprio motu*, after a conference with the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh, to reverse that decision. He thought that circumstance alone, and the fact that the character of the Under-Secretary had been more or less impeached in a public manner, required that there should be an inquiry into the circumstances of the whole case, and on that ground he would support the Motion of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman.

Sir JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) said he thought this debate had answered one very good purpose. He did not question in any degree the Chief Secretary's answer with regard to the case of Constable Anderson. A charge had been made that a minister of religion had intervened and asked witnesses what they were going to say, if he did not actually coach them. He did not say that in any reproachful sense, but the clergyman had tried to find out what evidence the witnesses were going to give before the tribunal that tried the case. That showed that whatever fresh inquiries they might have, there must be some different form of Court. It was utterly unsatisfactory that these semi-trials should be held. He held that there must be some radical change in connection with the police administration of Ireland, and that they must have some thoroughly judicial form of proceeding under which a man brought forward on a charge would be treated in a judicial manner.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [19th Allotted Day.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

Class IV.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,300, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for a Grant in Aid of the Expenses of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland."

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said the administration of the Queen's Colleges was a subject in which Catholics of all classes in Ireland took the deepest interest, and as to which they had expressed their opinions in the most emphatic terms. The fact was that the majority of the Catholic youth of Ireland were being deprived of a University education and that was a most vital matter for the country. To condemn the whole Catholic youth of the nation to such a condition of things was to practically condemn the nation itself, and it must lead to stagnation and decay in the field of intellectual and industrial enterprise. He wanted to draw on the actual facts regarding the condition of Irish University education. There were four University institutions—Trinity College, Dublin; Queen's College, Belfast; Queen's College, Galway, and Queen's College, Cork—which were endowed out of public funds. There was, however, another institution which was not endowed, except indirectly, and that only to a small extent, something over £4,000. He meant the University College, Dublin. The figures, which anyone could ascertain for themselves, showing the intellectual results were very remarkable. They showed that University College, Dublin, although endowed to the small extent he had mentioned, was a long way ahead of the Queen's Colleges, which were much more richly endowed. It had been the fashion of some persons to criticise this institution and to make sarcastic and abusive remarks about the alleged low standard of education adopted there. These results, however, which extended for ten years, from 1893 to 1903, ought to put to shame the persons who made such remarks. There was an institution which laboured under many disadvantages actually beating in fair and open competition the institutions munificently endowed by the State.

It was admitted on all hands that these three Queen's Colleges were not attended by such a number of Catholics as might be expected to be in attendance if they were institutions which coud be attended by Catholics without violating their patriotic convictions. The few score Catholics who attended them represented but a tithe of those students who might be expected to bring credit to the institutions if they were carried on under any system of which they could approve. What was their demand? Some years ago there was no doubt the demand of the Catholics of Ireland was for a Catholic University pure and simple in the strictest sense. If the Catholics of Ireland chose to demand such a University, open only to Catholics bound by the strictest tests, they would be quite within their rights. But some years ago the Irish Catholic Bishops, and practically the whole Catholic body in Ireland, altered their demand and expressed their readiness to submit to the principle involved in the abolition of the Test Act of 1871. The University which would please them would be one to which persons of all denominations would be welcome, and the prizes of which would be open to men belonging to every religion on the face of the earth if they were able to obtain them. In 1897 and 1898 the Prime Minister expressed his satisfaction with the frank and straightforward answers of the Bishops. He complained that no effort had been made to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission. As usual, the thing had been put on the shelf. In regard to the plan suggested by Lord Dunraven, newspapers in Ireland like the *Irish Times* which kept its eye on the Ministerial Bench and shaped its action on almost every subject accordingly, on the day on which it published Lord Dunraven's letter, published also an article approving of the scheme, and saying it did not see why everybody should not adopt this plan. He had there a telegram from the Archbishop of Dublin, which he had better read. It was—

> "You may state on my authority that the Bishops would have accepted either the settlement known as the Dunraven scheme or that recommended by the Royal Commission."

That statement, made by a leading member of the hierarchy in Ireland, and a distinguished writer, cleared away any excuses from the path of the Government if they meant business. But did they mean business? There was nothing now to prevent them from taking action save their own unwillingness to do anything.

By whom was this demand opposed? First of all, by the Irish Orangemen, some English Nonconformists, who objected to all religion in teaching institutions, and a section of English

Churchmen, who desired to have denominational education for themselves. The Orangemen were not to be confounded with the Protestants of Ireland, who were in favour of the demand for a University. The Orangemen were opposed to it because they remained what Edmund Burke and Moore had described them long ago. The argument of these poeple—whose only excuse was that they did not understand what they were talking about—was put in this way, "Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges are open to Catholics. We are satisfied, therefore you must be satisfied." The doctrine implied by that argument was the doctrine of the Penal Laws, and would justify the old policy of extermination. Lord Justice FitzGibbon, a distinguished Irish Protestant, had said, in reply to it—

> "Of course it may be said, and it is true, that the competition is equally open to everybody in Trinity College, and therefore that equality so far exists. I admit that, but I humbly object to become the judge of another man's conscience. If these people cannot conscientiously take what is open to them I consider their conscience has as good a right to be consulted as my own."

That was the attitude of the ordinary Protestant in Ireland, as distinguished from the Orangemen. But there were other arguments. The first was that the doctrine of the Penal Laws had been long since abandoned by the State, and that with it ought to disappear these restrictions on the intellectual advancement of the people of Ireland. Then, besides, the Orangemen were not the only people who paid taxes in Ireland, and had no right to veto the spending of money for a national purpose of which they did not happen to approve. The present English Solicitor-General was in favour of the Irish demand; the late Mr. Lecky had been in favour of it, and in fact, as he had said, the Irish Protestants, as distinguished from the Orangemen, were in favour of it. What of the English Parties who were opposed to it. There were some Radicals in that position; but Lord Spencer and, in fact, every ex-Lord-Lieutenant and Chief Secretary living was in favour of it. The Radicals who objected put themselves in an illogical position, because they voted for the Home Rule Bill of 1893, which gave the power to set up a University in Ireland for Catholics. A strong light was cast on the attitude of the Conservatives who objected to the Act. They demanded denominational education for England and Wales, and yet opposed the granting of an Irish University for Catholics. He challenged the right hon. Gentleman to say that that was not practically his judgment. If that were so was it not trifling with the Roman Catholic Bishops and with the hon. Members on that side of the House, and even trifling with the House itself, to put forth an expression of feeling as if he were going to do something for University education in Ireland, and then to put it out of sight altogether. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,200, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Clancy.*)

*MR. GORDON said he had listened with great care and attention to the speech made by the hon. Gentleman opposite, who was himself a graduate of the old Queen's University, and he was greatly pleased that the hon. Gentleman did not make any direct attack on the Queen's Colleges. The hon. Gentleman began by giving the Committee a large number of figures, the burden of which was to prove that the colleges in Ireland least endowed produced the greatest number of successful students. What he wanted to know was, what was the real force of the complaint of the hon. Gentleman and his friends? Formerly their demand was for a Roman Catholic University, but he was glad to say that for the last few years the Roman Catholic hierachy had given that up. If the Chief Secretary and the Government had the courage to resist the demands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, he was sure that within a reasonable limit of time the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the hon. Members who represented the Roman Catholic population would find it would be proper and wise to abandon altogether all idea of separate denominational colleges. What he wanted was that what every Irishman, whatever religion he professed, and however he might differ in his political views from other Irishmen, wanted was the best form of University education for their country, and that everything should be done by education to advance the material and social prosperity of the country. Some hon. Members who did not stay in their own country to get their education had different ideas. He did not know where they got those ideas from; but at all events their foreign education did not seem to have improved them. The position of affairs in Ireland with reference to University education did not seem to him to be one with which any fair-minded man could quarrel on the ground of religious inequality. The doors of Trinity were open to any member of the community who chose to go there; and whatever his religion he would be under no disability whatever. He might acquire the highest honours and get a fellowship without in any way interfering with his religion. He knew that a most distinguished Roman Catholic had, the other day, acquired a fellowship in Trinity. It might be his misfortune, or it might be because he was a Protestant, that he took a sensible view of the situation; but at the present moment no one had any right to say that he was debarred from getting a good sound University education in Trinity. He did not want to be misunderstood. He thought that formerly Trinity was managed on far too narrow lines, and that that had much to answer for in regard to the present position of University education in Ireland. He had heard the Prime Minister speak on this question on several occasions, and, so far as he could gather the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman, he regarded the question of giving a Roman Catholic University to Ireland as a matter of expediency; and he thought that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was of the same opinion. But he submitted that the argument of expediency ought not to prevail or induce them to do what they believed would not be in the best interests of University education in Ireland.

To go away from Trinity College, and take the comparison between the Queen's Colleges and the Catholic colleges in Ireland, the Protestants got nothing in this matter that was not equally available for Roman Catholics. The Queen's Colleges were perfectly free and open to all. That position was accepted at first by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and it was a very curious thing that a distinguished Roman Catholic Prelate was in favour of a mixed education at the time when these Queen's Colleges were founded with the idea of giving no religious denomination any advantage whatever. That was acquiesced in for many years, but the truth was that the Roman Catholic hierarchy had banned the Queen's Colleges because they found that they could not get control of them, and consequently they were denounced as godless colleges. The question of faith and morals was raised to give them the right to shut the doors of these institutions to the Roman Catholic youth of Ireland. He contended that the only safety for the education of the people of Ireland was to leave the Universities open to the youth of all denominations, and to allow no religious denomination as such to interfere with the teaching. Reference had been made to the Commission appointed to inquire into the University education of Ireland. He must say that the idea of appointing a Commission of Inquiry into University education in Ireland and leaving out Trinity, was to leave the part of Hamlet out of the play. He maintained that if that Commission was to make a useful investigation into the University question in Ireland, it ought to have had Trinity College and every other educational institution in the country within its control. The Report of that Commission could, therefore, not be accepted as a basis for any future legislation.

Reference had been made to the letter of Lord Dunraven; but of all the schemes suggested for a University in Ireland that was the worst. It was said that they might have three colleges absolutely free and open to every student in Ireland, and one which was to be purely a denominational college. So far as he could gather, each of the four colleges was to have the power of conferring pass degrees and a body of five or six gentlemen were to have the power of conferring honours degrees. They did not want that. They ought to have a high standard of University education and degrees conferred, of which the youth of the country would not be ashamed when they came to face the world. His point was that Irishmen did not want to see four colleges set up competing in the manufacture of degrees. These would be just like some of the degrees conferred by American colleges which nobody in this country valued to the slightest extent. Education for the youth of Ireland should be based on absolutely unsectarian and undenominational principles, and the best sources of education should be thrown open to all, without any attempt to teach any form of religious dogma. He believed that that was the opinion, not only of the intelligent Protestants in Ireland, but of a very considerable section of the intelligent Roman Catholics. There was no question of bigotry about this matter at all. Of course it was said that three-fourths of the people of Ireland were Catholics, and only one-fourth Protestants; but they must take into account the number of people who were likely to take advantage of a University education. He was sure that, even taking the numbers as stated, there would be many more Protestants who would take advantage of a University education than Roman Catholics. What was wanted in Ireland was a better system of higher education below the University standard but above the ordinary school level, and by such a system he believed more good would be done to the youth of the country than could be achieved by the creation of half a dozen Universities.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said the reason Catholics did not attend the Queen's Colleges was the same as that which prevented them from entering Protestant churches, viz., they did not believe it to be consonant with their faith and their principles. Speaking as a Protestant, he thought Catholics were entitled to the highest credit when they rejected educational advantages for conscience sake. This question of Catholic education was one of the saddest that could be brought before Parliament. It plainly showed the impotence of the Irish Party in constitutional agitation. The Chief Secretary and the Prime Minister were in favour of the Catholic claim, but, although they were in power, they refused to give Catholics that which they required, simply because a knot of reactionary Ulster Members declined to allow it. He was as good a Protestant as any Ulsterman, but he thanked God he was not a political Protestant, and there was an immense difference between a political Protestant and an Irish Protestant Christian. He knew more about the feelings and sentiments of the Irish Protestant population than hon. Members opposite, and he believed that the vast majority would be very slow indeed to refuse to Catholics, in consonance with their conscientious beliefs, those educational benefits which they themselves were able to receive. By the Vote now under discussion £15,000 was to be voted for the education of thirty students in Queen's College, Cork. There were only thirty students in honours, and there was a foundation in Arts alone of £12,000 a year. That sum of £12,000 would be spent equally advantageously if it were thrown into the River Thames. It was simply an abandoned and a profligate waste of public money. The president of the college, Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, never attended to his duties there, and he had not himself a University degree. What was more, he was appointed to this post, not for any educational qualifications, but in return for his services as the paymaster of Pigott in *The Times* case. St. Mary's College, an unendowed Catholic college, was able to secure twenty-six first classes at the last University examination, whereas Queen's College had only one. It was indeed a sham, and it was absurd even in its iniquity. The professor of law had three pupils, and there were four scholarships and two exhibitions. The professors of logic, metaphysics, and political economy had no pupils at all. The professor of Greek had three pupils and the professor of Latin four pupils. These professorships were given to political adherents. The sum of £15,000 was to be voted for a college which was of no use whatever to Ireland from an educational point of view. Whilst this was being done, the most miserable stipend was refused to a Catholic University. The object of those who took up this position was to keep all the good things in Ireland for themselves, and to prevent Catholics having a fair chance in life. This was a shocking condition of things. It awakened his keenest indignation as a Protestant. How much more, then, were he a Catholic would he feel this treatment? How could he endure it? The results of the intermediate examinations showed that there was a large class of Catholic youth who could form a distinctly University class. University education ought not to be the exclusive possession of the rich. In Scotland and England it was open to every boy, however poor and humble, provided he had the ability, to secure University education. The extension of such a system to Catholic Ireland would result in great advantages, and it could be done but for the opposition of Irish political Protestants. He had carefully refrained from attacking Trinity College, for which foundation he had the greatest possible respect, but in conclusion he might remind the Committee that every acre belonging to Trinity College was wrested from Catholic hands and Catholic educational purposes.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said his county was the second largest in Ireland but he certainly did not know half a dozen Catholic residents therein who would not like to see a Catholic University established. He could safely assert that in the whole of Ireland one could not find 100 Catholic families who would not favour such an institution. Further, they would find plenty of Protestants who would like to see Catholics have the advantage of a University. He asked the House to give full and due weight to what had been said from a Protestant point of view. He would like to know how many hon. Gentlemen opposite would not insist that in the Universities there should be a system of regular religious teaching. Everyone knew that both Oxford and Cambridge turned out very good Protestants and that in those Universities the Catholics would have a better chance because they would be protected by the conscience clause. One hundred and fifty years ago it was not customary to allow a schoolmaster to teach Catholics either reading or writing, but that rule had gradually been relaxed until Catholics were allowed to go in a very subordinate position to Trinity College. It was true that a few had changed their religion for the sake of emolument. If children were sent to Trinity College they were not asked to change their religion, but their faith was weakened because most of the Fellowships were held by Protestants, and everyone knew what that influence meant. He certainly preferred the system of Trinity to that of the Queen's Colleges because at the latter colleges there was no religion. Hon. Gentlemen opposite took precious good care to send their sons to Eton, Harrow, or Rugby, and afterwards to a religious University. Why should Catholics not be allowed to do the same. He knew that this meant £50,000 a year, but that ought to make no difference. Hon. Members opposite had told them they should be content with secondary education, but he asserted that it was impossible to get good secondary education without a University. They wanted good religious secondary education. In England a University education was a hall-mark, and it was time to give Ireland a similar stamp. Good statesmanship would give to Ireland everything that was given to this country. They had University education in England and Scotland and why not give it to Ireland. Catholics would not accept education unless it was religious. They did not want to exclude Protestants from a Catholic University, because a Protestant would be in exactly the same position as a Catholic was at the present time in Trinity College. They wanted in Ireland the same system which they had at Oxford and Cambridge, but they insisted upon having a Catholic atmosphere. If Catholics would only insist upon it they would get their University, but they would have to insist firmly, and he hoped that during the present recess something would be done to show the Government that Ireland was in earnest in this matter.

MR. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) said he was quite willing to give the Catholics all that, in his humble opinion, they were fairly entitled to. But with all that desire he could not see that they were in any way entitled to a Roman Catholic University for themselves. The Roman Catholic hierarchy would not be satisfied unless they had entire religious control of the students either in the college or the University.

MR. CLANCY: They say the reverse.

MR. WOLFF said that might be so, but they could not bind another hierarchy. He repeated that what the Bishops wanted was to have the full control and management of the students, and whatever safeguards they might introduce in the way of laymen on the board of management and in other directions would fail to secure their approval. If the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland would forego their demand to have the sole control and management of this institution the difficulty would be settled at once. There was only one Catholic University in the world in which the management was in the hands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and in every other State, in Germany, France, and Italy, Universities were non-sectarian.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway) said the hon. Member was mistaken. In the city of Quebec there was another instance in the Catholic University established under the Charter granted by Her Majesty Queen Victoria.

MR. WOLFF said he was not aware that Quebec and Montreal were on the Continent of Europe.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN said the hon. Member stated "in every other State."

MR WOLFF asked why if the Catholic hierarchy were satisfied in the places he had mentioned, could they not be satisfied in Ireland. If they would forego their demand to have the sole control and management the thing would be settled at once, and there was no reason why they should not make use of the Queen's Colleges. It was the exclusiveness of the Roman Catholic hierarchy which prevented any arrangement being made. That exclusiveness had done more than anything else to keep Parties asunder in Ireland. If Roman Catholic students were allowed to mix with the Protestant students in other institutions much would be done to remove the antagonism that existed.

MR. HEMPHILL said he did not intend to give a silent vote upon this question. He desired to express his unequivocal support to the granting of a University in which his Catholic fellow-subjects could obtain an adequate education. The very argument of the hon. Member for Belfast that some forty-five years ago there was not so much feeling between Catholics and Protestants as there was at the present time was an argument which showed that so far from the two religions getting reconciled it had become more necessary than ever that an opportunity should be afforded to their Catholic brethren of obtaining a proper education. The argument of the hon. Member for South Londonderry was practically to the effect that no matter how just or expedient the claim for a Catholic University in which the Catholics of Ireland might be educated might be, they ought not to grant this demand because if they only held out long enough in the House of Commons the Catholics of Ireland would be starved into surrendering their claim. That was not a worthy argument. Three-fourths of the population of Ireland were devoted Roman Catholics, and they could not indulge in such ideals in regard to education as the hon. and learned Member for South Londonderry. They might say, "Why not let the lion and the lamb lie down together, and why should there be any difficulty aboutt his question"? In these matters they must have regard to human nature, and they must recollect that the very peculiarities of these people were the outcome of the manner in which their country had been treated in bygone centuries. Up to within the last thirty years every emolument in Ireland was confined strictly to Protestants. As they were all aware, Ireland was a very poor country. It was admitted that in order to enable Ireland to compete with other nations it was essential that every boy in Ireland should be better equipped in regard to education, both technical and scientific, and in every other branch. Trinity College had old traditions and an old system, but it was impossible for a very poor boy to go to Trinity College, because the expense rendered it impossible. Trinity College was one of the most richly endowed Universities in the world.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University): Does the hon. Member know the amount of its endowments?

MR. HEMPHILL said he understood that it was about £30,000 a year.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: And does the right hon. Member call that the richest in the world?

MR. HEMPHILL said that he did when he remembered that another great college in Ireland only received about £5,000 a year. In the year 1885 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol promised that next year he would bring in a Bill establishing a University in Ireland. In 1889 the present Prime Minister promised them a scheme by which the wants of Catholics in Ireland in regard to education would be met. In 1901 the senate of the Royal University passed a resolution admitting its own failure after a twenty years trial, and they called for a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject. That Commission found that the Royal University was a failure, and reported in favour of further educational facilities being given to Ireland. He thought that Report of the Royal Commission disposed of the idea that the Royal University could be used as an argument against conceding what his hon. friends below the Gangway had so urgently demanded. This was not a Party question, for they all wished to see their fellow-creatures raised to as high a level as possible in this miserable world, and without education it was impossible to do this. They knew that Catholics were capable of the utmost development educationally. A good many of the errors of the Irish people might be traced to poverty, and their ignorance was a growth of this poverty. All they wanted in Ireland was a University built up on modest lines like the Scotch Universities and those on the Continent of Europe, which enabled every peasant's son, if he felt so inclined, to go and equip himself with a degree. They wanted a University in which the masses of the Irish people could obtain an adequate University education. What did the Irish Bishops themselves say in 1896. They declared that all they wanted was equality and that the question might be settled by the establishment of a distinct Catholic college or a University. Over and over again since that time the Bishops had declared that all they wanted was educational equality. He felt strongly upon this question, because he took an interest in the well-being of the rising generation in Ireland. He was satisfied that unless some further opportunity was afforded to Ireland of improving the general education of her people by means of a Catholic University all other forms of education would be more or less in vain, and Ireland would remain seething in discontent and under miserable conditions.

MR. WYNDHAM said the right hon. and learned Member for North Tyrone ended his speech by an eloquent aspiration for some system of education which would really give to all classes in Ireland what was required in order that they should be properly educated, waiving on one side or the other this or that ultra-sectarian view. He was with him in that aspiration. But in the beginning of his speech he stated that he would give unequivocal support to a Catholic University. That might be what he desired, but in stating that and in adding nothing to it——

MR. HEMPHILL made a remark which was not audible in the gallery.

MR. WYNDHAM said that was a distinction which ought always to be brought out sharply in any debate on the subject, and unless it was brought out those who spoke of a Catholic University instead of, say, a University for Catholics, failed to make clear what a great number of people in this country failed to see, namely, what was requested by many Irishmen in respect of University education. He dared say that a great many Irishmen desired a Catholic University. He had taken pains to study the subject and unless he was altogether in error, he took it that the real request made by the majority of Irishmen was that there should be started in Ireland a college in the position which would have been reached if, like Trinity College or the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, it had begun as a denominational institution with tests, and had abandoned those tests and gone on without them until it had become a college the traditions of which would be coloured by the faith of the majority using it. That surely was a wholly different thing from a demand for a State-endowed Catholic University under clerical control, and it was a request which he had always thought very reasonable. When the hon. Member for Belfast said that if the hierarchy gave up their claim he would support the endeavour of his Catholic fellow-countrymen to obtain better University Education he was delighted, but the hon. Member went on to point out that the only way of having a University free from ecclesiastical control was by accepting the existing institutions as being amply sufficient. They would never agree, he was afraid, in that matter. Those in this country who were in favour of denominational education held that it was reasonable that religion should be taken into account in these matters provided that there was neither clerical control nor religious test; but it was not the opinion of the hon. Member for Belfast and other Members in this House.

He had been led into contributing a few words to this academic debate but he had no idea that the whole question of University education was going to be raised. The Vote to-night was for £1,600 a year to each of the Queen's Colleges. He was always ready to give his views when they were asked for, but his views were not asked for now. Hon. Members always demanded in these debates a statement of the Government's position, and in that connection he would ask the Committee to consider the occasion. Hon. Members accused the Government of trifling with this question. Hon. Members opposite had raised the question twice during the session, once on 3rd August, after such Bills as the Port of London Bill and the Scotch Education Bill had been thrown overboard, and once on 3rd February on the Address, when it was impossible for any Member to vote for an Amendment without voting against the Government. Who was trifling with the question? [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: The Chief Secretary.] During the session the Irish Party had joined in every attempt to turn out the Government; and if they so conducted their political opposition as to make it impossible for the Government to deal with this question, the labourers question, or any other Irish question, then the whole blame did not rest with the Government. He wanted hon. Members for Ireland to think this out. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: We want you out.] He did not catch from what quarter that remark came. He had been looking up the speeches of Chief Secretaries and Prime Ministers upon this matter, and he found oddly enough that they were almost always given at the very tail end of a session.

MR. CLANCY: And promises always given for next session.

MR. WYNDHAM said he found that the next session began with an attempt on the part of the Irish Party, in conjunction with the Liberal Party, to turn out the Government. A statement was made on this subject by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol in 1885. He stated that this was a matter that deserved attention. He himself agreed with him.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said there was a pledge given in August, 1889, by the Prime Minister, who was then the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in regard to this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol gave the classic pledge and stated that this question should be approached with the hope of doing something to make University education more general and widespread in Ireland, and he added—

> "If it should be our lot to hold office next year we hope to make some proposal which will deal in a satisfactory way with this most important matter."

The Government was turned out within three days of the meeting of Parliament. When he considered the treatment meted out to the Labourers Bill he could not help anticipating that hon. Members would, as they did this year, make a determined attempt on the Address to turn the Government out. If that were so, why were the views of any Minister in respect to this matter to be treated in a totally different way from the views held by the Cabinet on, say, Scotch Education? Where was the prior and irrefutable claim that this should be dealt with immediately and at all costs and all hazards. It was impossible to deal with political questions in a representative assembly on those lines. There must be some attempt to get the question discussed under conditions which would permit of all arguments being put forward. The wisest words were used by Lord Salisbury, who, speaking in 1879, said that the difficulties of this question were very great and had hitherto defied solution, but he did not say that a solution was impossible. If he himself said all that he felt on the question he should be told by hon. Members opposite that he was giving pledges which he intended to break, and he would not lay himself open to that charge. In season he would advocate his views as boldly as any man. He thought it was the one gap in the Unionist position that they had not hit on a plan to fulfil the Unionist profession that they would do for Ireland all that any Home Rule Parliament might legitimately do, and when the time came he would do his best to convince any of his hon. friends who might differ from him in regard to this matter. For his part, he could not believe that Lord Salisbury, the right hon. Member for West Bristol, the Prime Minister, the right hon. Member for Thanet, whose illness they all deplored, every Chief Secretary and every responsible person who had been brought face to face with this problem, had been mesmerised and deluded by the atmospheric influences on the other side of the Channel.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said that if anything was wanted to convince the Irish people that the Chief Secretary was not in reality what he was represented to be, a sincere friend to the settlement of the University question, it was the speech to which the House had just listened. If he might use the phrase without any breach of Parliamentary order, he would say that it was an impudent speech. The right hon. Gentleman had accused hon. Members from Ireland of deliberately bringing on the discussion at a time when it was impossible for the subject to be adequately or seriously discussed. It would perhaps surprise Members of the House to know that personally, and through the ordinary channels, he had urged upon the right hon. Gentleman that there should be a discussion of this question, not at a nine o'clock sitting, but at the commencement of the sitting of the House. The question had been put on one side in order that an altogether fruitless and ridiculous discussion should take place on the treatment of Constable Anderson. The right hon. Gentleman at the commencement of the session was questioned on this matter, and to the amazement of many Members of the House, certainly to the amazement of the Irish Party, he stated that not only was the Government not going to introduce legislation on the subject, but that in his view the Government ought not to legislate on it; although, as he had repeated again to-night, every Governor of Ireland who had been in the position of Lord-Lieutenant or Chief Secretary, everybody, from whatever Party drawn, who had been connected with the Government of Ireland for many years past, was a declared supporter of this policy. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night was an unsatisfactory and an impudent speech. The right hon. Gentleman said that if they had asked a day for the discussion of the subject it would have been given to them. He, who opened the session by declaring that the Government would not legislate, said that they ought to have asked a day for the discussion of an academic Motion on which the Government and their supporters could vote with a free hand, knowing that there was no intention of following it up by legislation. For himself, he would refuse to lend himself to such a transparent dodge as that, and to whitewash the Government for having broken all their pledges.

The classic pledge was not that which the right hon. Gentleman had referred to, but the one made in 1889 when the present Prime Minister said that legislation upon the question was necessary, and would be introduced, and when he was asked by Mr. Parnell for something more definite and if he would say that the Bill would be the first measure introduced next session, the Prime Minister added that it would be impossible to state beforehand the precise order in which the Government measures would be introduced. That was an absolute pledge on the part of the Government that they would legislate on the question. They had been in office for he did not know how many years, and they had made no effort to legislate. All the time they had been endeavouring to hoodwink public opinion in Ireland, and the public opinion of Irishmen in this country. The right hon. Gentleman had said nothing at all about the Dunraven letter or about the negotiations going on in Dublin last autumn and winter, when it was represented to them on behalf of the Government that this scheme which had been put forward was a scheme which had the consent of the Government. He had heard it stated that it was a mere matter of chance that Lord Dunraven's name was put to that letter at all, and that it was doubtful whether the name of the right hon. Gentleman himself would not be appended. That letter had been put forward by the Government, and was so represented to them and to the hierarchy.

MR. WYNDHAM: I emphatically contradict that statement. I am not at all ashamed to say that I thought it my duty to see a number of Presbyterians and members of Trinity College, and to see the two Archbishops. I asked them to state their views in black and white, as I thought it was my duty to know their views. But I did not pledge myself or the Government.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that was the way in which the right hon. Gentleman deliberately attempted to trick and hoodwink public opinion. It appeared that he went to the hierarchy with a scheme and got them to make concessions they had never been asked to make before, and then, having tricked them into making concessions, he came forward and said—"Oh, I was only speaking for myself and not for the Government." The right hon. Gentleman's action was a disgrace to the Government to which he belonged, and he hoped it would be thoroughly understood in Ireland.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (MONEY).

Resolution reported.

"That it is expedient to authorise the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, any sums which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities, the principal of and interest on such Exchequer Bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make provision for the discharge of any sums so borrowed out of moneys annually provided by Parliament."

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he rose to move an important Amendment. He understood the position of the matter was this. The Chancellor of the Exchequer desired to borrow a sum amounting to £9,250,000, and he would like to borrow this sum in terminable annuities, but unfortunately that source of supply was now not so good as it was in the past; and therefore they brought forward this Resolution with the object of borrowing that sum on Exchequer Bonds. He thought it was admitted that borrowing on Exchequer Bonds was an undesirable form of procedure. It meant a large amount of interest being paid, and it also cost money to place these Bonds; and he was not sure that it would not mean that a less amount of money was devoted to the paying off of the National Debt in the future than in the past, because there was no obligation whatever on the Chancellor of the Exchequer to form a sinking fund. If he borrowed on terminable annuities, there would be an automatic reduction of principal and interest; but if, on the other hand, he borrowed on Exchequer Bonds, they were entirely in his hands as to the amount he would set aside for the purposes of a sinking fund. He did not, therefore, think they ought to give him greater power than was absolutely necessary. He understood that it was possible for him at the present time to raise £3,000,000 of money by means of terminable annuities. If this were so, he would like to know why they should be asked to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer power to raise the whole of this money in the form of

Exchequer Bonds. The Amendment he proposed to move was to put temptation out of his way, and to limit the amount of his borrowing to £6,250,000. There was also another point of view from which they had to consider this matter. He, for one, could never forget that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a Protectionist; and that it was to the interest of the protectionist scheme to prove that all trades were in a dying condition, that the finances of the country were in a desperate condition, and therefore to pave the way for the policy of which they had heard so much. For this reason, and also for reasons of economy and of sound finance, he desired to move an Amendment which would restrict the borrowing power of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to £6,250,000. The Amendment he desired to move was therefore to insert after the word "sums" in the second line of the Resolution, the following words, "not exceeding in the aggregate £6,250,000."

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'sums,' to insert the words 'not exceeding in the aggregate £6,250,000.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) rose to support the Amendment owing to the present state of national finance. What, he asked, was the state of things which had caused the necessity for this Resolution? It was simply this, that the Government had got the finances of the country into such a hopeless state that the Bank of England would give them no more credit. The Government could no longer borrow in their accustomed place and by their customary method; and, therefore, they had come forward in this way to increase their power of borrowing by means of Exchequer Bonds. What did the difference mean? Borrowing on account of public works loans by means of Exchequer Bonds instead of by terminable annuities had several curious effects. One had been pointed out by his hon. friend. They had no security, in the second place, for the sinking fund. It depended upon the will of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Estimates of the year; and it was difficult to see that the proper amount was paid off year by year. Later on he proposed to move an Amendment to ensure that there should be a certainty of the proper amount being put aside for sinking fund when these borrowings took place. But there was another effect. They could place Exchequer Bonds at a discount, and terminable annuities they could not. Did the House realise that the credit of the country was such that they had to pay 3½ per cent. in the largest money market in the world to get further credit; and the worst of it was they were going from bad to worse? He would like the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give them a statement for the three months of the current year, how much he had borrowed since 1st April. As far as he had been able to follow the thing, there seemed to have been hardly a week pass without borrowing taking place of some sort or another. Anybody who watched the weekly returns of the income and expenditure of the country, he thought, must be seriously alarmed at the financial result of the current year. The right hon. Gentleman's Budget was supposed to be a modest instrument; it did not look like it now, and he would like to ask him if he would give them a frank statement of the gross amount of total indebtedness, and how this had been dealt with in the four months now expired of the present financial year; that was to say, how many lapsed borrowings had been renewed, how many had been paid off, and how many fresh borrowings had taken place?

He must say that he looked with great anxiety on the present condition of the country's finances, especially from the fact that the Government by their money operations seemed to be making things worse week by week. Had the Chancellor of the Exchequer thought of what was in front of him? There were obligations he could not avoid owing to legislation already passed. He did not think he could have considered these things; at any rate, he did not think the House could have considered them, and he was sure it was time they had a review of the situation and knew exactly where they were before they gave a blank cheque or even a cheque for £6,250,000 to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He recognised that from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's personal point of view the Resolution was all right. He wanted the power to borrow as much money as he could with as few restrictions as possible; but this was not what he (the speaker) conceived to be the functions of the House. He thought they ought to make it difficult for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to borrow, especially when they knew that they had borrowed far too much already, and they ought to take every step in their power to restrict borrowing and to ensure that the tendency would be to pay out of revenue. He supposed they must give up all hopes of the Transvaal war contribution; the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself told them that even within the next twelve months he was not going to ask for it. They had therefore nothing coming in to look forward to, and they had got to face the situation with the liabilities they had. He wish to speak very warmly against widening the borrowing powers of the Chancellor of the Exchequer until they saw a different spirit in controlling the finances of the country and a determined effort to reduce the Debt and not to increase it.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH (Bristol W.) said he hoped the hon. Member would take it from him that this had nothing to do with the great question of protection or free trade. It was totally irrelevant to that question; and it had very little to do with the general financial position of the country. The hon. Member was quite mistaken in supposing that the Resolution before the House would give the Chancellor of the Exchequer unlimited power of borrowing. There was nothing of the kind possible under this Resolution. What were the facts of the case? Parliament had authorised the Government to incur a certain debt for the purpose of naval and military works. In the past it had been the universal practice for loans of this kind to be borrowed through the system of terminable annuities. This had been possible, because there had been deposits at the Post Office Savings Bank which it had been possible to invest in terminable annuities at very remunerative rates of interest, and also remunerative to the persons to whom the money belonged; but lately these deposits had largely fallen of. This had nothing to do with the general finances of the country, unless they said that the general financial condition of the country had raised the interest on money. Then, of course, it had something to do with it; but, as a matter of fact, interest on money had risen, and since then depositors had been few, and persons had placed their money in other investments. Very well. His right hon. friend not having at his command the source other Chancellors of the Exchequer had had at their command, he asked the House to enable him to carry out the duty Parliament had imposed upon him already by giving him power to borrow these loans through Exchequer Bonds. This was an absolutely legitimate, and not only a legitimate, but a necessary proceeding. Unless Parliament gave the Chancellor of the Exchequer such power, he would be unable to carry out the Naval and Military Works Loans Act which Parliament had already passed. He sympathised with the hon. Member in one sense. He had no doubt, and he thought many hon. Members on that (the Ministerial) side of the House, and he was sure the Chancellor of the Exchequer would desire to see a stop put as soon as possible to the enormous increase of these loans; but he (the speaker) said as much last year speaking on the Naval Works Bill, and he was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman shared that opinion. This right hon. Gentleman could not borrow a single penny on this Resolution on the Bill beyond the amount that Parliament had already authorised, and, more than that, by the terms of the Resolution and he thought by the terms of the Bill, it would be made necessary for the Treasury every year to provide in the Estimates a sum for the interest on these Exchequer Bonds, and for a sinking fund for them precisely as had been the practice under the system of terminable annuities. Then why was it that this proposal should be opposed, unless hon. Members wished to prevent the Government carrying out the duty Parliament had imposed upon them. He did not think they ought to offer opposition.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said his hon. friend, as far as he remembered, did not mention free trade or protection. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol had stated that the falling off in the Savings Bank deposits was in no way due to scarcity of money in the country, but to a rise in interest which had induced people to seek other investments.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I did not say it was in no way due to a scarcity of money.

MR. LOUGH said the right hon. Gentleman said it was due to the fact that the rate of interest had increased that the people had sought other investments. This was an easy way of getting over the difficulty. They on the Opposition side of the House were convinced that the serious difficulties existing in the country were caused to a large extent by the free borrowing for these very purposes, and, under these circumstances, his hon. friend had made a suggestion which he really thought the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down might support. He thought the House ought to hesitate before it took the right hon. Gentleman's advice. What was the suggestion which his hon. friend made? It was simply that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should borrow as little as he could, that, if £6,250,000 would be sufficient for immediate purposes, he should be content with that sum. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was borrowing nothing but what Parliament had sanctioned. This was perfectly true, but it did not carry them the whole way. Parliament sanctioned a sum of a large amount and left it to the Treasury to say how much should be spent in each year. They had had no statement of expenditure in the present year. It was only the previous night that they heard how much would be required for military, naval, and Civil Service works. It was part of the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to see whether that amount ought not to be restricted, and this was all his hon. friend asked him to do. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to see if he could not reduce the amount, or, at all events, to give them the particulars they asked for.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol gave them an admirable and clear statement of the facts, but he did not think he was justified in saying that it had been the universal practice to borrow money for naval and military purposes on terminable annuities. It had been in every case a statutory requirement that the money should be so borrowed, and the reason was obvious. Not only was the interest then provided for, but also the sinking fund. It had been a principle of all Naval and Military Works Acts that money should be borrowed on terms by which a sinking fund should be provided. What was the Chancellor of the Exchequer asking them to do now. He was not asking them to give him power to carry out the existing Act, but to give him power to borrow money without providing a sinking fund.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: That is not so. If I rightly interpret the Resolution, it provides for both principal and interest out of the votes of each year.

MR. McKENNA: I have read the Resolution, and it contains no such provision. If no such term is in this Resolution, then the Chancellor of the Exchequer is asking us to go beyond the existing Naval and Military Works Acts, and is asking us to give him powers which he has not now.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am quite willing to admit that there ought to be provision of the kind in the Bill.

MR. McKENNA said the right hon. Gentleman would agree that the Resolution ought to contain annual powers to raise money on such terms that the sinking fund should be provided for. The Resolution said the interest was to be paid annually out of money provided by Parliament. Why not the sinking fund? If it had been intended to include the sinking fund, it should have been referred to in the Resolution; and he went further and said that, if it were in the Bill, the Resolution would have to be recommitted for the purpose of amendment. The right hon. Gentleman, in so far as the Resolution made no provision for the sinking fund, was going outside the principle on which all Naval and Military Works Acts had been passed. There was another ground why he appealed to the House not to sanction any further borrowing powers. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer had got to come to them again in order to get money, he urged that they should take the opportunity of reconsidering the Naval and Military Works Acts in one respect: ought they to spend any more money at the present time on the building of barracks intended for an Army Corps system, when it was quite possible that on the following Monday they might hear that after all a new scheme had been adopted, and there was to be a great reduction in our standing military forces? As a mere matter of economy, ought they not to take this opportunity of reconsidering the Naval and Military Works Acts and to refuse to sanction any further borrowing? If the Army Corps scheme were abandoned and they were to have a reduction in the military forces, it was undeniable that large sums of money now being spent would be wasted, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer might take the opportunity not to borrow money for the purposes of these Acts. As they were told that the final question of the Army must wait until public opinion was ripened, ought not these military works to wait so that, at any rate, they might avoid borrowing more money at the present time than was absolutely necessary? By such avoidance they would stop the rapid decline of Consols. He did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer had realised how burdensome to the trade of the country was the high price of money. So long as the money market had to fear new issues of Consols or Treasury Bonds or Bills, so long would money be dear; and unless Consols were allowed to rise or were forced up, money would remain dear and trade would continue bad. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to take this opportunity to economise on what might be more wasteful military expenditure and to give the money market a rest.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said the hon. Member appeared to think that no provision would be made for a sinking fund, and he objected to this system of borrowing on Exchequer Bonds on the ground that it did not place upon the Treasury an obligation to provide a separate sinking fund to extinguish this debt. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) the previous night explained that the Bill would contain an obligation on the Treasury to provide for the discharge of any loans out of money annually provided by Parliament, for the services for which the loan was raised, within a period not exceeding the maximum fixed by the original Act enabling the Treasury to borrow. That was to say, that within whatever period was fixed by the Naval and Military Works Act these Exchequer Bonds would have to be paid off. His right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol answered another objection, taken by the junior Member for Halifax, that there was no limit to the amount of borrowing that he could undertake if the Resolution were carried. The amount of borrowing was limited to the amount already sanctioned by Parliament. He quite concurred in the opinion expressed that it was not desirable that annual Bills for these capital purposes should form a permanent and constant part of the ordinary financial machine. He was not now asking the House to give any extended power of borrowing; he was not asking for favour to borrow more money than the House had already sanctioned; he was only asking the House to enable him to discharge the obligation it had imposed upon him. He had already made representations to the First Lord of the Admiralty and to the Secretary of State for War to reduce the borrowings to the narrowest limits, and with their concurrence and assistance he had been able to reduce the amount likely to be required in the present year from £10,000,000 to £9,250,000. But they could not stop great works in existence if they wanted to do so. These great building works were being constructed under contract, and the contractors would have very heavy claims for damages if suddenly, when halfway through the work, they stopped their progress and paid them no further instalments. These were obligations which the country had undertaken and which the country must fulfil. Even if they could stop these works suddenly, surely it would not be an economical thing to do! Until the works were complete they got no advantage for their money; it was lying idle and gave them no return, or at any rate only a slight return. In conference with his two right hon. friends, the heads of the two great spending Departments, and with their assistance, he had arranged that only that work should be undertaken at the present time which was necessary under existing contracts, was required for the completion of works already in progress, or for some urgent purpose of defence. Of course, the barrack question had been receiving the careful attention of his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War in order that no money should be wasted by any possible changes which might follow the reorganisation of the Army. He hoped the House would agree to the Report of this Resolution, and then they would be able to see the Bill itself.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us what the period is?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN replied that in the case of the Naval and Military Works Loans the period was fixed at thirty years. This was the general period. In the case of public offices—those big buildings in Whitehall—the term was fifty years. Thirty years, however, was the normal and general period.

MR. SOARES: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the question as to whether £6,250,000 is not enough, having regard to his statement last night that he could borrow £3,000,000.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that what he had asked the House to do was to authorise borrowing on Exchequer Bonds the amount which the House had authorised to be borrowed on terminable annuities. He did not think any useful purpose would be served by adopting the hon. Member's suggestion. It would merely involve the repetition of a similar Bill next year, and it would not restrict in any shape or form either the obligations of the country or the amount of borrowing which had to be done.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said the right hon. Gentleman and also the Member for West Bristol had given them explanations which, no doubt, to some extent made this proposal less unacceptable to the House. It was comforting to hear from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the heads of the Naval and Military Departments had given instructions that no further progress was to be made with the wasteful and unnecessary contracts for works which had been made by their immediate predecessors, and that these unnecessary works would not be further proceeded with in the existing financial situation. He would not associate himself in any marked degree with the acrimonious and controversial criticisms which the hon. Member for Islington made against the Member for West Bristol. He believed the right hon. Gentleman, in spite of the difficulties with which he had been confronted, and which arose from the fact that he was an adherent of a Party which had always been addicted to expenditure, had been a consistent friend of economy. The right hon. Gentleman said that the proposals could not be said altogether to involve the general financial situation of the country, and, he went on, it seemed to him (Mr. Churchill), to adduce arguments, and to offer explanations, which showed how very closely this Resolution, was involved, with the general financial situation of the country. The explanation which he offered of the circumstances which had led to this departure from the ordinary practice was itself conclusive, and showed the connection between this Resolution and the general financial situation. He took it that the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to borrow this sum of money by Exchequer Bonds instead of by terminable annuities, and he understood from his speech that the same provision would be made for a sinking fund to pay off the Exchequer Bonds as would have been made in the case of terminable annuities.

Why was it they had to borrow by Exchequer Bonds instead of by terminable annuities? The explanation was shortly outlined by his hon. friend, and it was a very significant and instructive story. Terminable annuities had never in the past appealed to the general public. A security repayable by the Government at the end of, say, thirty years, with possible extension, and with a comparatively low rate of interest, had not in former times been the kind of security the public wished to invest in largely; and, consequently, the Government had been forced to rely for the provision of the money borrowed on terminable annuities, not upon subscriptions from the general public, but upon sums of money which might be lying under the charge of the National Debt Commissioners, arising from the balances in the Post Office Savings Bank. Hitherto these funds had been sufficient to meet the charges which these loans required; but now they were not. Why? For two reasons. The loans had been steadily increasing in size and the funds had diminished in amount. This double, unhealthy, and exhausting operation had destroyed that source of credit. The causes were obviously twofold. In the first place, there was a great increase of taxation, which had caused a scarcity of money all over the country, creating the present financial situation, and carrying with it a curtailment of enjoyment and the straightening of means of every class. This was the first cause of the falling off in the sums of money at the disposal of the National Debt Commissioners. There was another reason advanced by the hon. Member for West Bristol. He said that other securities had risen in the returns they offered to the public, and in consequence of this rise the Post Office Savings Bank no longer presented such an attraction as it formerly did to investors. This was perfectly true, but was it consoling? Why was it that other securities had risen in price? Was it not from the same alarmingly evil tendency with which they were now called upon to deal. It was the more remarkable that the Post Office Savings Bank should not attract the investor to-day, when they reflected that the proposal to reduce the interest on the Savings Bank deposits had been dropped. It might have been understood that there would have been a falling off in the sums of money there had there been a reduction of the interest, but the interest had not been reduced, and for the same disquieting reasons that the rate of interest had risen so high and securities had fallen so low the Government itself should invest in such a way as to pay the old rate of interest, not fall back upon the new rate. Notwithstanding this, there was a great falling-off in the sum of money lying to the credit of the National Debt Commissioners. This in itself was surely a sufficient reason why this Resolution was intimately associated with the general financial position, and it was in itself, he thought, quite sufficient justification for the criticism which had been directed against it from his side of the House and also for the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Devonshire.

He should certainly support that Amendment, because it limited the operation of this very costly and extravagant method of obtaining money, to what was barely necessary for carrying on the immediate needs of the Government. He thought that if, in the very clear and conciliatory explanation offered to the House by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, there was one part unsatisfactory, it was that in which he dealt with the Amendment. So far as he could gather, his only objection to it was that he might be forced next session to ask for £3,000,000. They would not complain if the control of the House over the finances were thereby increased; and, if this were the only reason of the right hon. Gentleman, he would surely be well advised to accept the Amendment and expedite the proceedings. Borrowing on Exchequer Bonds at the present time would cost the country something like 3½ per cent. What did this mean? It meant that this great, powerful Empire, which had so long been at the head of all the financial communities of the world, was now reduced to borrowing on terms which a few years ago would not have satisfied some miserable pettifogging corporation in a difficulty. This alone was the measure of the financial demoralisation of the country. He was pleased to hear the right hon. Member for West Bristol say that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was anxiously endeavouring to reduce the practice of borrowing by loans and of carrying on public works by loans, which had so greatly developed of recent times. He was glad also to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself corroborate this; but he would suggest to him that, if he were to infuse a spirit of larger economy into his general conduct of public affairs and treatment of political questions, he might find a much greater power of retrenchment than he would find by private bargainings with heads of Government Departments who had already established a scheme for consideration. The fact that we had to borrow at 3½ per cent. by this method, was in itself an indication of the situation in which they found themselves, and the Resolution, which they only had an opportunity of discussing for half an hour the previous night, was one of a succession of blows which had been struck year after year at the credit of the country. He was not going to do more than mention one or two of the principal blows which had been struck.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member must confine himself to the Resolution, and not discuss the history of past years.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not consider the close and careful attention the House felt bound to pay to the financial proposals he had made was in any particular sense directed against himself personally, or against the specific proposals he had made. It arose out of the growing anxiety of the country at the general financial situation. That situation was now so grave and serious that Parliament was obliged to give it undivided and uninterrupted attention; and until some amelioration had been achieved, either by the practice of rigid economy or by the co-ordination and regularisation of our outstanding liabilities, the Government must expect that all their financial proposals would be the object of severe scrutiny and criticism.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said the right hon. Gentleman had admitted that a great deal had happened since the borrowing of the money was authorised. Not only had the financial resources of the country become restricted, but a new Army scheme had been brought before the country, and it was evident from that scheme that a good deal of the work sanctioned was not required. It was evident, too, from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman himself that what was needed by the House was a clear statement on the part of the Secretary of State for War as to what these barrack requirements really were; and with that lack of information the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not be surprised that this demand for money to go on with these permanent works should be very closely scrutinised by the House, circumstances having entirely altered since the authorisation of these works was given. Let them take the example of Aldershot. New camps had sprung up there until there was far less room for manœuvres, although the troops quartered there had increased. He believed that a great deal of the money borrowed and spent at Aldershot had been absolutely wasted, wasted to the extent of hundreds of thousands of pounds. He believed that the money spent at Salisbury Plain was to a great extent well spent money; but he thought Aldershot was an instance where public money had been squandered. It might be impossible to prevent some contracts being carried out; but judging from the way progress had been made there, it should be possible even now to stop some work and save the need of borrowing money which would simply add to that already wasted. It was all the more necessary that economy should be exercised, because, as they well knew, there was some inevitable expenditure.

Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided—Ayes, 132; Noes, 48. (Division List No. 306.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J.A. (Worc.
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T.L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, SW.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Rt Hn J. Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Griffith, Ellis J.

Mr. Munro Ferguson.

Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kilbride, Denis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided—Ayes, 48; Noes, 130. (Division List No. 307.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Ferguson, R.C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kilbride, Denis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Soares and Mr. Bright.

NOES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T.L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William.
Foster. Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin &Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. Stafford, (W.)
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.Col.Thos Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col. Edw. J
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, RtHnJ.Parker (Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt.Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided:—Ayes, 130; Noes, 45. (Division List No. 308.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn.A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Beach, Rt.Hn.Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt.Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C.W(Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. JA (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir William Hart
Fergusson, RtHn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick, S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E. (Elgin &Nairn
Gordon, J.(Londonderry, South
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Marq.of (L'donderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords.,N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hope, J.F (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred)
Massey-Mainwaring Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan, David J(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, RtHn A.Graham (Bute
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Ruthuford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S.G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, RtHnJ. Parker(Lanarks
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel Wiliam George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kilbride, Denis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Malley, William
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Shipman, Dr John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Woodhouse Sir J. T (Hudd'rsfield

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Slack and Mr. Theodore Taylor.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (MONEY) BILL.

"To enable the Treasury to borrow, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for purposes for which they are authorised to borrow by means of terminable annuities;" presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 292.]

CUNARD AGREEMENT. [MONEY].

Resolution reported.

"That it is expedient to authorise the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of such sums, not exceeding in the whole £2,600,000, as are required for making the Advances to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited), under an Agreement with that Company, dated 30th July, 1903, and approved by the House of Commons 12th August, 1903, to authorise the Treasury to borrow money, by means of Exchequer Bonds, for the issue of such sums or the repayment thereof, the principal of and interest on such bonds to be charged on the Consolidated Fund, and to make other provisions relating to the said Agreement."

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said the House had now arrived at a very important subject, which had two aspects of great interest. It was now half-past one, and, if they took a discussion at this stage, it must necessarily give rise to a somewhat prolonged discussion. He therefore, suggested to the Government whether it would not be better to undertake, upon the terms of their being allowed to get this stage with very little debate, to give the House at some future stage of the Bill, a fair and reasonable chance of discussing it

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that this was a Bill which for the first time embodied the policy of the Cunard Agreement, but it was merely a Bill for carrying out the deliberate Resolution the House of Commons passed last year, for simply finding the money to enable them to pay their just debts. He did not see that this was a matter which required a long debate, either at this stage or another.

Mr. BRYCE said he certainly understood from his Answer to a Question that the right hon. Gentleman had intended to give the House an opportunity for a full debate on the matter.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was always glad, if he had the time at his disposal, to give them the opportunity of discussion, but he was not always aided in that desire by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. In the present case, as the House knew, the time available for finishing the business of the session in a reasonable period was not great, and it was impossible for them to upset their arrangements unless some strong reasons were shown, and in his opinion no strong reason had been shown. There was really no alternative at all as regarded this Vote unless the House was to show itself utterly unworthy of its traditions.

*__Mr. NORMAN__ (Wolverhampton, S.) said it seemed to him particularly desirable that the matter should receive further consideration from the House, and he did not think he should be exaggerating if he said that he had never heard a more trivial reply than that of the Secretary to the Admiralty yesterday. His remarks consisted of two quotations from the speeches made some time ago by Members on the Opposition side of the House, both of them speaking entirely without official knowledge and authority. It was a very important question, involving great matters of policy and very large sums of money under different circumstances from those when the matter first claimed attention. It was then done somewhat suddenly. He had heard, and he thought correctly, the word "panic" applied to the legislation then passed. What was called the Atlantic Combine had come, from the point of view of its promoters, to a disastrous conclusion, and therefore the measures which the Government thought fit to meet those circumstances no longer existed, and no longer had the justification they originally had. He remembered that the President of the Board of Trade on behalf of the Prime Minister said he would give an evening for this debate. It was true that some time was given last session but it was on 12th August, the very last day of the session. This might be fulfilling the letter of the promise, but he certainly did not think any hon. Member would say that it was fulfilling the promise in the spirit. He was sure that the Prime Minister was the last Member of the House anyone would suspect of sharp practices and he would appeal to him whether when he said that he was not able to give a day before Whitsuntide, although in the strict letter of Parliamentary law he was not legally compelled to give any time, they had not, like another class of persons to whom the Prime Minister had been very kind lately, a "reasonable expectation of renewal" of the debate. One other topic arose in connection with the matter, and it was that a new departure in steamship construction had arisen and had received the approval of some and the condemnation of other experts. Since this very large sum was proposed to be given by the Government in subsidising cruisers, the two vessels that were to be built and in respect of which the money was to be found were to be built on the turbine principle. This was a new departure, and, as far as he was aware, not a single syllable had been said in justification of this entirely novel and mechanical engineering procedure before this large sum of money was to be spent in this connection. For these reasons he ventured to support what his right hon. friend had said and to express the opinion that some explanation more than was given the previous night was needed to justify the Resolution.

Sir JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said this was an important question in which the whole shipping industry took an interest, and he did think there ought to be an opportunity given for a full debate when there could be a fuller House and when many absent Members who were deeply interested in it were present. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had made it plain that there would be an opportunity given for discussing the matter, and he hoped he would do so. The Resolution referred to other provisions relating to certain agreements, but there had not been a word of explanation as to what these other provisions were.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that if the suggestion made were accepted, he would refrain from entering into the discussion in any way, but, if it were not, he could not refrain from saying a few words about it. On the last occasion he moved the rejection of the Resolution; and he thought it was a little too strong for the Government to ask them to accept the Bill without any opportunity of discussing it. A very remarkable thing happened about the debate on the last occasion. They pointed out that great new principles were raised in the suggestion, and the next morning *The Times* made the remarkable announcement that the acceptance of this Resolution practically meant the restoration of the Navigation Laws. There was protection with a vengeance. The thing was a very far-reaching proposal, and the agreement was one that they were bound to examine on every opportunity they got. There was one aspect brought before his mind by the best authority he knew. He pointed out to him that in this agreement with this particular company the Government was taking a step in quite an opposite direction to that which they were told it would be wise for them to take. This shipping company did not trade with the Colonies; it traded exclusively with foreign countries, and the subsidy was to be given for trading with one of our greatest commercial rivals in the world. Surely if a great subsidy of this kind were to be given without any competition and without trying what other companies might do who were trading with our own Empire, it was a very strong step for the Government to take. He thought this aspect was one the House ought to consider.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that from the very first moment that he read the agreement he was satisfied that the House would never be given a reasonable opportunity for discussing it. Let hon. Members as business men look at the facts of the agreement. A company with a capital of £1,600,000 had £2,600,000 lent to it at the rate of 2¾ per cent., which he ventured to say was a rate they could not get in the open market. But this was not all. Not only did the company get this loan at 2¾ per cent., but it was to get a subsidy of £150,000 a year. The loan which had to be repaid in instalments and interest came to £165,000 and the subsidy the company received was £150,000, so that the net balance which the company had to pay to the British Exchequer was £15,000. We got £15,000 a year and advanced £2,600,000. What was the reason? It was to be found in one of those preliminary passages which began "Whereas." "Whereas," it said, "His Majesty's Government is desirous that the company's business should be maintained under the British flag." Every other steamship company would have the right to come upon the Government and demand enormous loans at ridiculously easy rates to secure that their ships should run under the British flag. Was not the flag sufficient itself? Were they so ashamed of the British flag that they had to bribe companies in order to induce them to remain under it? Our shipping industry, which had kept pace with the whole shipping of the world, and which was as great as the whole shipping industry of the world, had grown up without any of these aids. Was it reasonable that the House should be hurried into incurring debts under conditions of national excitement on the last day of the session when discussion became impossible, and was it reasonable now to say that they must pay this debt? The company knew that the agreement was not valid until the Bill was passed, and the House did not surrender its freedom to subsequently reject the agreement when the Bill was introduced by the passing of the Resolution. We were not only debtors but creditors. Let the Government get their debts from the Transvaal. Let them make them pay, if we had to pay; we had far better claim. If ever there was a Bill on which the House ought to have an opportunity of expressing an opinion in full debate, he submitted it was on a Bill of this sort, under which a single company acquired a huge profit at the public expense.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central) said that the hon. Member for West Islington had suggested that the proceedings might be shortened if the Government would undertake to put the Bill before the Treasury Bill on the next occasion. They would be prepared to accept that suggestion if it would have the effect of shortening the debate. They would undertake to bring on this Bill at its next stage at twelve o'clock, but it must be understood that it would be necessary to take the other Treasury Bill the same night.

MR. BRYCE: I presume it is part of the arrangement that the House will not be asked to go further to-night.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No.

MR. BRYCE: And it will be taken first at twelve o'clock?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Mr. Gerald Balfour, and Mr. Pretyman.

CUNARD AGREEMENT (MONEY) BILL.

"To make provision with respect to an Advance to be made to the Cunard Steamship Company (Limited), under an Agreement with that Company, dated the thirtieth day of July, nineteen hundred and three," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 293.]

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at four minutes after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 4th August, 1904.

NEW PEER.

The Lord Bellew—Took the Oath.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Minster (*M. Conyngham*)—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons.

Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment to each Bill. The said Amendments to be considered To-morrow.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.]; King's College Hospital Bill [H.L.]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Ship Canal Bill [H.L.]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Felixstowe Gas Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; South Shields Gas Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill. Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*)), and reported from the Committee. (No. 179.)

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill; Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; of "George Bird" Lodge of Good Templars; Western Temperance League; and Inhabitants of Doncaster; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition for Amendment of; of residents in New Windsor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (WALES) BILL (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

Message to the Commons for Reports, etc., of the Select Committee.

EGYPT, No. 2. (1904).

Despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General at Cairo, enclosing a report by Sir William Garstin, G.C.M.G., Under-Secretary of State for Public Works in Egypt, upon the Basin of the Upper Nile.

COLONIES (ANNUAL).

No. 422. Gibraltar (Report for 1903). Local Government Board. Thirty-second Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1902–1903. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer for 1902–3. Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903–4.

Army. (Army Reserve)—Further regulations relating to the Army Reserve; (Militia)—further regulations relating to the Militia.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURT JURISDICTION IN MIDDLESEX.

Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State to inquire into the question of metropolitan police court jurisdiction in Middlesex; with evidence.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND), 1903.

Part I. Criminal statistics.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Return of evictions in Ireland, for the quarter ended 30th June, 1904.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Return of all British ships ordered by the Board of Trade or its officers, during the period from 1st July, 1903, to 30th June, 1904, to be provisionally detained as unsafe by reason of the defective condition of their hulls, equipments, or machinery, or by reason of overloading or improper loading, etc.; also of all foreign ships ordered to be provisionally detained during the same period as unsafe by reason of overloading or improper loading; together with summaries showing respectively the total number of ships ordered to be detained as unsafe, from 1st July, 1903, to 30th June, 1904, and since the 1st October, 1876 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 1715.].

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BANKRUPTCY.

Twenty-first General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883.

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP)

Thirteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act,) and ordered to lie on the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

Reported, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL.

Committed for Monday next.

WILD BIRDS PROTECTION ACTS AMENDMENT (ST. KILDA) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

ARMY COUNCIL BILL

Moved, "That the House do go into Committee on this Bill."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, before the House goes into Committee on this Bill I should like, although I do not wish to oppose any of the details in the Bill, to again put to His Majesty's Government the Question which I asked the other day. I then pointed out that, so far as I knew, the military officers appointed on the Army Council were in a different position from the admirals and captains appointed on the Board of Admiralty in that they were appointed for four years. The noble Earl the First Lord of the Admiralty told me I was wrong, and that in the Patent it was quite clearly shown that they were appointed in the same way as the

Lords of the Admiralty, namely, not for a term of years. I have reason to believe that certain officers understood the contrary, and accepted the office on that understanding. I think it would be as well before the House goes into Committee that we should have an assurance on that important point. I am quite clear of this, that there has been a misconception about it on the part of those who have received the appointments.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, the intention of the Government certainly was that they should be appointed for four years. What I think the noble Earl behind me intended to convey was that the term four years is certainly not mentioned in the Patent. Still, it is true that the intention when these officers were appointed to their present posts was to follow the recommendation of the Esher Committee and appoint them for four years. But, technically, that is not laid down.

*EARL SPENCER: I called attention to this matter, not that I desire myself that they should be appointed for four years, but in order to prevent an injustice being done to them, which would be the case if they had accepted office on certain terms, and found that those terms had been altered since.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: There has been no alteration since, so far as my knowledge goes.

House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1—

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said he was anxious to have some assurance with regard to Clause 1, which provided that there should be transferred to the Army Council—

> "All statutory powers and duties which at the date of the passing of this Act are exercised and performed by the Secretary of State for War."

The noble Earl in charge of the Bill would be aware that all Secretaries of State exercised a variety of powers. He supposed it was intended, by using the word "statutory," to exclude the general powers of the Secretary of State as such. Otherwise the proposal in the Bill would be open to very grave objection, as it would give the constitutional powers of the Secretary of State to the Army Council. He hoped very great care would be taken to examine into what were the statutory powers of the Secretary of State, because the Secretary of State's office was a very ancient one, and might have attached to it very ancient powers which ought not to be transferred from the Secretary of State to any other person or board. He, therefore trusted that His Majesty's Government had gone very carefully into that question. The Bill also proposed to allow three more persons to sit in the House of Commons than could sit there now. That was a question more for the House of Commons than for their Lordships' House; but he entered an emphatic protest against a Bill of this importance and magnitude being forced through Parliament at the end of the session.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, as regards the first point which was raised by the noble Marquess, his contention is absolutely correct. The statutory powers are powers chiefly found in the Army Act, the Reserve Forces Act, and the Militia and Volunteer Forces Act. The term "statutory powers" is inserted in order to absolutely distinguish these powers from the other powers which the Secretary of State, as Secretary of State, has. This is a provision entirely on all fours with the Act which was passed when the office of Lord High Admiral was abolished.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON pointed out that the Lord High Admiral was not a Secretary of State. A Secretary of State was a person possessing very peculiar constitutional powers. That was the reason why he pressed the matter.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: This Bill only transfers to the Army Council the statutory powers of the Secretary of State. As to the other points raised by the noble Marquess, the Bill does not enable three more holders of office to sit in the other House. The

Secretary of State, the Under-Secretary of State, and the Financial Secretary sit in Parliament at the present moment, and there is no intention of allowing three members of the Army Council, in addition to those three officials, to sit in either House; and if there was any such intention, the Pay Warrant, which provides that no officer on full pay shall sit in Parliament, forbids it. I can assure the noble Marquess that we have no intention of altering that clause of the Pay Warrant.

Lord MONKSWELL asked whether the noble Earl would have any objection to inserting in the clause after the words "all statutory powers and duties which are exercised and performed by the Secretary of State for War," the words "as Secretary of State for War." He thought that would make the matter clear.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: I will consider that suggestion between this and the next stage of the Bill.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

***The Marquess of RIPON** said that in his opinion this clause, which dealt with the right of members of the Army Council to sit in Parliament, did not correctly represent the intention of the Government as stated by the noble Earl. As he understood the noble Earl's statement, it came to this, that there were to be three members of the Army Council—the Secretary of State for War, the Under-Secretary of State, and another—who might sit in Parliament, but that was not clearly expressed in the clause. He asked that the Government would consider the matter.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: I will certainly do so.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to: Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

The Earl of Donoughmore.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL BILL.

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

LEEDS UNIVERSITY BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Marquess of RIPON: My Lords, This Bill is *mutatis mutandis* identical with the Liverpool Bill which has just passed through Committee in your Lordships' House. The Leeds case is precisely on all fours. The University College of Liverpool and the Leeds University were both Colleges of the now dispossessed Victoria University, and the object of this Bill is to continue to the Leeds University the privileges which the Victoria University formerly possessed.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Ripon.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of KINTORE: My Lords, though your Lordships are, of course, anxious to reach the Committee stage of the Licensing Bill at as early an hour as possible, yet I think it will be the wish of the House that I should offer quite a short explanation of how the legislation proposed in this Bill comes to be laid before Parliament. I can make such a statement in a few words, and your Lordships will then be able to pass from the discussion of matters affecting water which is merely salt to the consideration of questions affecting the consumption of other and possibly more deleterious fluids.

In the spring of last year whaling stations or factories were established in the mainland island of the Shetlands from whence to fish the whaling area lying between thirty and eighty miles to the North and North-West of it. This year two more stations have been established in the Shetlands and two in the Hebrides, one of which is in Lewis and the other in Harris, and all these stations, with the possible exception of one only, are owned by companies with a foreign register, and worked under the Norwegian or Danish flag. It is found that under our existing law there are practically no restrictions or regulations applicable to the conduct of a whaling industry. Last year the number of stations was two and the steamers two. This year the numbers are six and nine, or more. Next year may see a further increase, and your Lordships will, I am sure, agree in thinking this state of things to be unsatisfactory.

The whales hunted are the large finner whale. They are hunted by small fast steamers fitted with a bow gun firing harpoons with an explosive shell, and the whale, when killed, is towed into the factory, either by the ship itself or by tow boats specially built for the purpose. Then, and under no restrictions whatever, the fun begins, which last year very promptly caused complaints, and energetic complaints at that, to be addressed to the authorities. Thereupon the Secretary for Scotland appointed a Departmental Committee to visit the localities and to investigate and report. The complaints into which Mr. Donald Crawford, K.C., Sheriff of Aberdeen, Kincardine and Banff (Chairman), Mr. Robert Camperdown Haldane, of North Voe and Lochend, Shetland, and Mr. William Hutchison Leask, Provost of Peterhead, were appointed a Committee to inquire, ranged themselves under two heads—(1) that the treatment of the whale carcases had been the cause of nuisance and danger to public health and even to navigation; and (2) that whaling injured the herring fishing. One short quotation from their Report will show your Lordships the conditions on which these complaints were founded, and will give the Committee's opinion thereon—

> "When the two Ronas Voe stations began fishing last year they were without appliances for the disposal of the carcases. They took the blubber and left the carcases lying about in and out of the water uncleaned, with the stomachs and intestines. . . . As we walked towards those stations, with the wind blowing from them, the smell was perceived and was offensive at a distance of a mile and a half. . . . Down the Voe there are no less than eleven herring-curing stations occupied for perhaps four to six weeks in the summer by a population of about 1,200 or 1,300. Last year the festering carcases were an intolerable nuisance. When complaint was made to the sanitary authorities the whalers were, unfortunately, directed to tow them out to sea. Portions of the putrid carcases got loose and went ashore; when towed out some of them came back, and others remained as a danger to small boats. The water of the Voe was so polluted with oil and offal that the curers could not wash their barrels with it, and the mussel scalps in the upper portion of the Voe were injured and partially destroyed."

The Committee stated that if the object of these companies, registered under a foreign flag, with steamers manned by foreign crews, and employing for the most part foreign labour at the stations, bringing all their own stores, and not seeking to purchase any commodities on the spot had been to raise hostile feeling against their undertaking, no means of accomplishing that purpose was overlooked. And the Committee go on to say, and I am sure your Lordships will agree with them, that—

> "If the condition of the stations which existed last year, or anything like it, were to continue, our opinion would be that they should be put down. The problem is a clear one: whether every portion of the carcase can be treated within a strictly limited time and no portion whatsoever returned to the sea or left unused on the shore. If that is done there will be no nuisance except the smell. We are satisfied that it can be done. . . . We carefully examined the Alexandra station before it began to work. So far as we could judge, it started with appliances which will, so long as it does not bring any more whales than can be timeously treated, obviate the danger of any nuisance.'

The Committee added—

> "On the whole we are satisfied that under proper regulations and inspection the industry is not open to objection on the ground of nuisance or danger to public health."

But, my Lords, while we are considering the conditions of a foreign industry established on or near our shores, we are not likely to forget an infinitely more important industry of our own, yearly carried on in the same neighbourhoods, and the House may be sure that the complaint spoken to by a considerable number of witnesses, that whaling injures the herring fishing, received ample consideration from the Committee. The belief that such is the case is very commonly held, but the point on which witnesses were agreed as establishing its accuracy, was that a whale spouting frequently indicates the presence of a shoal of herring. Yes, my Lords, but herrings are constantly found where no whale is in sight, and, equally, herring fishing is constantly, regularly, and successfully carried on in water where no whales exist. Further, it is known that it is not the finner, but the herring hog, a smaller species of whale, which, as a rule, shows the presence of herring. On these objections the Committee report as follows—

"Our opinion of the objections as a whole is that they may be accepted as showing that unrestricted whaling might be a possible danger to the herring fishing, but they are not valid reasons for the total prohibition of whaling. Total prohibition would, we think, have consequences more dangerous to the herring industry than regulated and limited whaling. The expulsion of the companies from Shetland would certainly lead to the establishment of floating factories, one of which is already at work in more northern latitudes. There are large steamers which flench the whales on board and turn the carcases adrift. Further, the ground now fished by the Shetland whalers could be fished from the Faroë Islands without restrictions, and beyond British control, and no doubt would be. It the whales are valuable to the fishermen, they would in this way be destroyed in larger numbers, and if there is a risk of disturbance of the ground it would be greatly increased. . . . We believe that the new industry may prove to be beneficial and valuable, as it has done in Canada and Newfoundland, and that it should not be crushed without a trial. . . . In very poor districts such as those where the stations have been introduced, the opportunity of regular employment in a new industry is a matter of importance. Already a certain number of inhabitants are employed. The managers are anxious to increase the number even on grounds of economy. We should hope that commercial relations would also greatly increase. The Norwegian whalers are a kindly and peaceable race and mingle without friction with the Shetlanders, to whom they are near in blood. If licence duties are paid to the county council, the benefit in a poor district will be appreciable. Whaling, however, though it should not be suppressed, ought to be regulated and limited. Unrestricted whaling would be an evil on other grounds than its possible danger to the herring industry. It could not last long. The Basque and the Greenland whaling industries came to an end by the practical extermination of the species pursued with the means of destruction now brought to deadly perfection. The same fate would overtake the finners off our coasts in a very short time. That would be an evil in itself, and while a few companies might go out of the business with a large profit, the local industry would be brought into being only to perish in a few years, and leave the inhabitants worse off than ever."

On the whole matter the Committee are of opinion that—

"The new whaling industry ought to be permitted to continue, but only under limitations and regulations,"

and they go on to make certain recommendations. My Lords, all their important recommendations are embodied in this Bill. The Bill enacts that no persons shall kill whales without a licence from the Fishery Board, under a very severe penalty; the licensee must be a British subject; a licence duty of £100 per annum during the three years currency of the licence is to be payable, which duties are to go to the county council, on whom the duty of fishing inspection will fall. No licence is to be granted for more than one steamer, and tow-boats are prohibited. The capture of the herring hog whale is prohibited, and so is the capture of whales accompanied by a calf, but no licence is required for the capture of the small bottlenosed whale. No whaling is permitted within the three mile limit; all whaling is prohibited from 1st November to 31st March, and it is to be within the power of the Fishery Board to prohibit whaling during the summer herring fishing within forty miles, for any period not exceeding five weeks.

My Lords, we believe that under these restrictions and regulations whaling can be profitably carried on without danger to the public health and without detriment to the herring fishery; that, so carried on, it will bring employment to an increasing number of our own people, and will bring to more than one poor district appreciable benefit. It is with that hope, and in that belief, that I ask the House to give a Second Reading to this Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

LICENSING BILL.

House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1:—

Lord COLERIDGE explained that Subsection (1) of Clause 1 provided that—

"The power to refuse the renewal of an existing on-licence, on any ground other than the ground that the licensed premises have been ill-conducted or are structurally deficient or unsuitable, or grounds connected with the character of fitness of the proposed holder of the licence, or the ground that the renewal would be void, shall be vested in quarter sessions instead of the justices of the licensing district, but shall only be exercised on a reference from those justices, and on payment of compensation in accordance with this Act."

He moved to amend Sub-section (1) by inserting after "The power to refuse the renewal of an existing on-licence," the words "other than a licence, the holder of which is under an agreement to purchase any of the commodities or goods which he sells or uses from or to deal with any particular person, firm, corporation, or company." He hoped the House would not be alarmed at the apparently far-reaching nature of the Amendment. At first sight the Amendment would appear as though it prevented compensation to all tied houses. He did not think that if the Amendment were passed that would be its practical effect. He thought its practical effect would be to put pressure on the owners of tied houses to place their tenants in such an independent position as to enable them to claim the benefits under the Act by way of compensation, and, therefore, it would indirectly, he thought, produce a great deal of good. He did not think people were generally aware of the extent to which the law declined to recognise anyone in the matter other than the licence-holder. The latter was the man recognised as the licensed person, and so far was he recognised, and alone recognised, as the person responsible that, for instance, in an extreme case of a licence-holder being convicted of an offence under the licensing laws, the owner of the house was not permitted to appeal against that conviction, although the conviction might imperil the licence, on the ground that he was not the person aggrieved. The law looked only to the licence-holder.

Under that law a system had grown up of putting in men who obtained the annual licence who were mere caretakers to the brewery company which owned the house. He had had experience of looking into the agreements come to between brewers and publicans, and very often it was found that the rent was a high one reducible to practically *nil* if all the beer, spirits, and other commodities were purchased at a particular brewery. Or, again, they had the case of a licence-holder being required to sign a blank transfer which enabled the brewery company to get rid of him at any moment, and the result of that was this, that for that person, that mere caretaker, that mere bird of passage, the licensing justices had no terrors. He had so little interest in it that he did not take the same care to conduct his house well as a man who was more independent. There was in the persons selling liquor the natural desire to profit by the liquor which they sold, but the temptation to the manager or caretaker of a tied house was great, and the pressure put upon him to sell an excessive quantity of drink was far greater than the natural pressure of trade competition upon a more independent person. The result of that wa disastrous to the community, because it encouraged the tied-house manager to adopt all kinds of devices in order to satisfy the brewer.

He knew from constant experience that again and again respectable managers were turned out because they had not pushed the trade sufficiently to satisfy the owners. That was a mischievous and disastrous system, and anything that directly or indirectly checked it ought to be welcomed by all lovers of sobriety. He did not believe that if his Amendment were adopted it would affect all brewery companies alike, but he ventured to think that a great many brewery companies would be delighted at it. They had been forced into the position in which they found themselves by trade competition, and many of them would much rather be rid of it, and would, he believed, look gratefully on any legislation which would deprive them of that trade competition which resulted in these evils. His Amendment was in the interest of temperance, and he did not believe against the interests of brewers.

The Minority Report of the Royal Commission spoke most strongly on the subject of the tied-house system. It was said that the general effect of this system was to push the trade and sale of liquor to the utmost; and the Report gave this most cogent instance, that no tied-house manager ever applied for a six-days licence because he was not permitted to.

What a comment that was upon this system. An independent licence-holder could and did constantly get his Sundays to himself by securing a six-days licence, but the wretched manager of the tied-house could not do that. Both the Majority Report and the Minority Report thought that the agreements should always be produced on application for transfers, and before a new licence was granted, and that it should be left to the licensing authority to say whether the terms were such as to warrant refusal of the licence. He was by his Amendment putting into the hands of the new licensing authority that power, with this weapon at the back of it, that if the terms were such as to warrant the refusal of the transfer such terms ought to be sufficient to warrant the refusal of compensation. He did not think the Amendment had a far-reaching scope, and was convinced that matters would very soon adjust themselves to the new conditions.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'licence' to insert the words 'other than a licence, the holder of which is under an agreement to purchase any of the commodities or goods which he sells or uses from or to deal with any particular person, firm, corporation, or company.' "—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

LORD BELPER: My Lords, the noble and learned Lord accompanied the remarks which he made on his Amendment by the statement that he did not think it would have the effect of excluding all the tied houses from getting compensation under the Bill. He founds that proposition on the idea that some of them, at all events, would be willing to fall in with the wish of the Legislature, and, no doubt, in order to avoid losing all their compensation might be inclined to do what they could; but I must point out that the whole object that the brewers have had in giving very large competitive prices for the houses is to have those houses under their control and sell the liquor which they brew themselves. I do not say that that is a good state of things or a bad state of things, but what I do say is that Parliament has known for years what has been going on. They have taken no action whatever to interfere with it, and they have at all events by their silence, and by the fact that they have not made this illegal, allowed the brewers to get control of the very large number of houses now in their hands. If this Amendment was carried, I venture to say it would destroy the whole of that part of the Bill which deals with the existing houses.

The tied houses are, numerically, something between 80 to 90 per cent. of the whole number of houses, and if that number were withdrawn from the operation of the compensation clauses, I really do not see how those clauses could be effective at all. I should like to say one word, although I do not think it is absolutely material to the Amendment, with regard to tied houses. The noble and learned Lord, in moving his Amendment, alluded to the Report of the Licensing Commission. He referred not only to the Minority Report, but also to the Majority Report. Now, what does the Majority Report say with regard to the tied-house system? It says—

"The evidence produced before us, in our judgment, shows that under a good and careful brewer it may operate advantageously and produce excellent results. On the other hand, it is no doubt true that under less advantageous circumstances it may have a contrary effect."

And it goes on to say that—

"Evidence has been given before us proving that it can be so operated as to be very successful from the point of view of public order. Under a careful brewer it may, owing to the greater power of selection of men, produce better results than the tenancy plan, and the limited interest of the manager in the sales commends itself to many."

They also stated in another part of the Report that the evidence as to tied houses did not justify the statement that the tied-house system leads to more drinking. It is quite true that the Minority Report takes a somewhat different view. Their conclusion is that the general effect of the tied-house system is to push the trade in liquor, it being impossible to lay down any other general statement. I must say that if the Amendment is founded purely on the ground of the great evil of these tied houses, I do not think the extracts I have read from the Majority Report, at all events, would justify such a very stringent step as to shut them out altogether from all compensation.

Just consider what the effect would be if this Amendment were carried. I take it that if they are to have no compensation they could not be called upon to contribute to a compensation fund, and if that is the case the compensation fund would be enormously diminished. If that was not done, and they were called upon to contribute to a compensation fund from which they would get nothing at all, that, in my opinion, would be nothing short of pure injustice. And if they are not going to contribute, what will be the result? The object in view in bringing in this Bill is not simply the interest of the brewer and the licence-holder, but of the public. It is generally admitted on both sides of the House that the only way in which we can get the magistrates to act to the full extent of their powers and reduce materially the number of public-houses is by setting up some fund of compensation under which they shall receive some value for the houses that are done away with, and if the tied houses are to receive nothing and the other houses are to receive compensation, it seems to me that the result will be very much like what we are trying to avoid by this Bill. For the magistrates, when the question arises as to what houses they should do away with, will naturally feel that it is rather hard to do away with houses that are going to receive no compensation. The tendency will therefore be to do away with the other houses, and, therefore, by the Bill you will actually be putting some premium on the possession of tied houses, and will give them rather more security under the Bill than they would otherwise have. I do think that that is an important point even from the noble and learned Lord's point of view.

I venture to think that the question is not merely one of whether the tied-house system is a good system or a bad one. The Legislature have allowed this state of things to go on. Brewers and others have no doubt paid enormous sums of money to secure these houses, because they have thought it worth their while to do so, and to say that those who are under a system which you dislike and of which you disapprove are therefore not to receive a return for the money which they have invested, seems to me to be something like pure spoliation. In these circumstances, and seeing that it would strike a fatal blow to the successful working of this measure, I hope your Lordships will not accept the noble Lord's Amendment.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I referred in my speech on the Second Reading of this Bill to the question of tied houses, and I then stated that I objected extremely to the system which had grown up, and which I thought was a very great evil in the country. Not only does it enhance and drive up by competition the value of the houses to an abnormal and unnatural figure, but it has also the effect of taking away the independence of the publican, who is really the most important man in regard to the keeping of the house in an orderly and respectable manner. Several of us ventured to quote figures to show the exorbitant prices which houses had run up to. Surely that is a great evil. I venture to think it is also a great evil politically that there should be set up in all towns and villages this organisation controlled from a centre. I admit that it would be enormously difficult to deal wholesale with tied houses, My noble and learned friend explained that his object in moving this Amendment was only indirectly to bring pressure on tied houses and to obtain the greater independence of their tenants.

I confess I should rather hesitate to vote for any measure directly and positively forbidding tied houses. Privately, I should desire it very much; but I do not think it could be done, at any rate in this Bill. If noble Lords opposite consider that my noble and learned friend's Amendment goes further than the noble and learned Lord has stated, surely it would be possible to amend it. I desire to see something done to set up the old independence among publicans which I knew when I was a young man. If publicans were restored to an independent position, it would, I think, lead to a much healthier and better state of things from the point of view of public morality. The fact that in 80 or 90 per cent. of the public-houses throughout the country the publicans who manage them are forbidden to have a six-days licence is in itself a gigantic evil, and one that ought to be remedied. If my noble friend's Amendment would go in that direction, I should rejoice; if it is thought that it would go further, perhaps the noble

Lord in charge of the Bill may see his way to amend it.

The LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition has given a very half-hearted support to the Amendment. He is evidently quite conscious that it goes a great deal further than he himself would be prepared to support.

*EARL SPENCER: I merely supported the arguments of my noble and learned friend.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl said he would not be inclined to support any alteration in the law which would altogether forbid tied houses.

*EARL SPENCER: I wish I could.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl said it would not be right.

*EARL SPENCER: Not in this Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: If we are not prepared to do a thing directly, we should, I think, shrink from doing it indirectly. I ask your Lordships to have the courage of your convictions. If you think tied houses are a mistake, proper legislation might be brought in to put an end to them if adequate compensation were provided; but to place tied houses in a worse position in this Bill than the other houses, which is the object of the noble and learned Lord's Amendment, would be, in my opinion, indefensible. I have another objection to the Amendment. The noble and learned Lord himself said he doubted whether it would be as far-reaching as it appeared at first sight. I suggest that the noble and learned Lord would have the greatest difficulty in working his Amendment at all. It is almost impossible to prevent an arrangement being come to by both parties where both parties are willing, and you would be exposed, if you agreed to this Amendment, to all sorts of collusive and colorable arrangements, under which almost the same system would continue as at present. The law takes no cognisance at all of the relations between the brewer and the publican. We ought not to interfere with contracts which free Englishmen enter into, and which have existed under the protection and authority of Parliament for so many years.

THE LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER said that though he was not able to support the Amendment he thought the discussion upon it had brought out a point which they ought to keep well in mind when they came to consider the scale of compensation. What had been said might very well be turned against the tied-house system. They had been warned that this Amendment might lead to collusion on the part of the persons concerned. Had there ever been an instance of the introduction of a vast system into the country which had been more underhand and surreptitious than the introduction of the tied-house system? It certainly could not claim to have come upon the country in a straightforward manner. He thought that character of the tied-house system ought to be kept very carefully before them. It had never been his custom to say one word in disparagement of brewers or publicans, but when they dealt with this particular system they were bound to look at it in its true character, and his contention was that when they came to consider, for example, one or two of the Amendments which were on the Paper, which dealt with the scale of compensation, they ought to consider what kind of trade it was that they were about to compensate, and ought to limit the amount of compensation accordingly in the interests of the public.

If a man desiring refreshment went into a public-house which was a tied house his freedom in the choice of liquor was limited, and in this matter the liberty of the public, as well as that of other individuals, ought to be taken into account. He did not blame the brewers or the publicans for organising themselves to defend their interests, but at the same time he held that it was a public danger and mischief that there should be such an organisation holding Parliament almost inthralled, as it undoubtedly did. It was radically unsound in a variety of ways that they should have the wholesale trade acting as the motive and driving power of the retail trade, urging it on to sell the maximum of spirituous liquor that it possibly could. Parliament should not practically bar all efforts at radical reform of the liquor traffic later on by now building up so big a financial barrier. He hoped the question of the scale of compensation would be considered with an open mind, and with a single eye to what ought to be their predominant consideration—the welfare of the people.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON regretted that the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal had not said one word in the course of his remarks which tended to show that he had the slightest feeling with regard to the many evils attached to the tied-house system. The noble Marquess might have objected to the noble and learned Lord's Amendment; he might have proposed an Amendment to that Amendment, or he might have advised the House to reject it altogether, but there was no reason why, if the noble Marquess and His Majesty's Government had any conception of the evils attached to the tied-house system, there should have been no acknowledgment of their existence.

He entirely agreed with what was said by the right rev. Prelate who had just sat down as to the great financial operations which had been carried on of late years. The result of those operations had been to place practically almost the whole business in public-houses throughout the country in the hands of a great and wealthy combination. That, he humbly submitted, was a very grievous evil. He saw it growing up in other countries as well as here. Here they had, he rejoiced to think, only one trade of that kind to deal with, and they had had plenty of proof within the last few days of the power and influence of that trade. But in other countries, and especially in the United States of America, these vast combinations, these great trusts, grew up and increased day by day. They exercised an immense influence on politics—aye, and a corrupting influence, and he did think it was a very great evil indeed that needless countenance should be given to the existence of a body of that kind in this country. If there had been any acknowledgment on the part of His Majesty's Government that such an evil did exist and that it was in the public interest that it should be restricted, he would not have troubled their Lordships; but he did feel so exceedingly strongly upon that point, and felt so greatly the immense evils of these vast trusts, that he could not avoid entering a protest against the omission of any observations on that subject in the speech of the noble Marquess. There were some people in this country who desired to pursue a fiscal policy which would increase the number of these powerful trade combinations, and which would tend to bring them into still closer intercourse with our public life. What they saw before them to-day of the influence of the brewery companies in this country was ample reason to make them pause. One such example was quite enough.

VISCOUNT PEEL, though he sympathised with the noble and learned Lord in his desire, if possible, to abolish the evils of the tied-house system, yet did not like the indirect attack upon that system contained in the Amendment. Entirely agreeing that evils did exist, he protested against the remark which had been made by the noble Marquess that a contract between a brewery or distillery company and the man who took a licence was a contract made between two free people. He quite recognised that as long as brewery companies were willing to lend, and poor men were willing to borrow, so long would the tied-house system exist. The only thing the Legislature could do was to aim at it in this way: The licensing magistrates before whom the applicant came should be at liberty to inquire in what terms that man stood towards the brewery or distillery company which had put him into the house, and whether there was anything in the contract as to the terms on which the licence-holder should take liquor from a particular house. If the contract provided that the man should be capable of being turned out at short notice, that was a direct violation of the terms on which the State granted the licence. For himself, he would like to see power given to magistrates to enable them to do away with the contract, if it militated against public policy, no matter what power was at the back of the licence-holder. That was, he thought, a better way of dealing with the matter than that proposed in the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord.

LORD COLERIDGE said the noble Lord in charge of the Bill had stated that the result of the acceptance of the Amendment would be to deny compensation to 80 per cent. of the trade, and that it would invalidate and make foolish the whole of the financial proposals of the Bill. The noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal, on the other hand, said it would be entirely inoperative, and would have no effect because of collusive arrangements. It was difficult for him to answer those arguments, because they were mutually destructive. He felt that there was a great deal in what had been said by the right rev. Prelate, and that this was not the part of the Bill in which a remedy could be most easily applied. He would, therefore, not trouble the House to go to a division.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS moved an Amendment to provide that the renewal of a licence should not be refused on the ground that the premises were structurally deficient or unsuitable unless the magistrates had previously made an order for alterations which had not been complied with. He said that under the clause as it stood the renewal of a licence might be refused because the premises were structurally unsuitable, but there was no provision by which the licence-holder should be acquainted with the fact that his premises were structurally deficient. It seemed strange that a man should lose his licence on this ground when he was not in the least aware, when applying for a renewal of his licence, that his house was structurally deficient. To remove this doubt, which he thought might lead to great injustice, he proposed to add the words that this should not apply unless the applicant had received an order calling upon him to effect structural alterations and had failed to comply with that order.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out from the first word 'or' to the first word 'or' in line 8, and insert the words 'that the applicant has failed to comply with an order for structural alteration under Section 11, Sub-section (4), of the Licensing Act, 1902.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am sure the noble Earl was too modest to recognise the reason of the cheers which greeted him on his rising to move the Amendment standing in his name, and I respectfully desire to join in the congratulations of noble Lords on the auspicious occasion of the noble Earl's birthday. I wish I could supplement that observation by a cordial consent to the Amendment of my noble friend, but I think your Lordships will agree that the Amendment is one which should not be accepted. In the first place, the Act to which my noble friend refers—the Act of 1902—only provides for structural alteration, and does not make a provision in case of complete unsuitability, whereas the words which are in the Bill, and which my noble friend proposes to strike out, prevent the licensee whose premises are altogether unsuitable being within the category of those who cannot be suppressed without compensation; therefore, the procedure which my noble friend proposes to substitute is not in any way equivalent to the procedure which he proposes to strike out, inasmuch as in our Bill unsuitability is dealt with, whereas in the Act of 1902 only structural deficiency is provided for. That is one reason.

Another reason why I cannot accept the Amendment is that in the Act of 1902 the procedure is very cumbrous. The warning that structural alterations are to be made is subject to appeal, and that, of course, may take up a long time. But the main reason why the Government are unwilling to accept this Amendment is this: The effect of the clause is to prevent a licence being suppressed without compensation except on certain specified grounds. The real question is, Is structural deficiency one of those specified grounds which ought to entitle a man to compensation? and we think it is not. It stands on precisely the same footing as the unfitness of the licensee himself. In order that he shall be entitled to receive compensation if his licence is suppressed, he ought to be thoroughly fit himself, and his premises ought to be thoroughly fit. The Government are unable to accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY then moved to insert the word "structurally" before the word "unsuitable" so as to make the sentence read, "are structurally deficient or structurally unsuitable." He said the Amendment was merely a drafting one. As the words stood in the Bill there was a little doubt whether the adverb applied to "unsuitable" as well as to "deficient." That was the intention of the Government, and some kind of understanding had been come to in the other House that it should be made clear. He therefore moved the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 7, after the second word 'or' to insert the word 'structurally.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH asked how this Amendment affected the question of police supervision. It would not protect the public against the possibility of public-house premises existing which were not suitable for police supervision.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: There is no question of preserving any public-house which ought to be suppressed, but certain public-houses ought to receive compensation when they are suppressed. We hold that if they are structurally unsuitable they ought not to receive compensation when suppressed. The case the noble Earl has put comes within those which ought to receive compensation. The fact that there does not happen to be a police station near a public-house is no reason why the house should be abolished.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said a building might be unsuitable for the purpose of a public-house although the actual building in itself might be structurally suitable. A public-house, for instance, in a place where there was no light and the access to which was through a back alley was certainly structurally unsuitable, though the structural unsuitability did not attach to the actual building. It seemed to him unreasonable to assert that with a limited compensation fund they were to give compensation in respect of premises which were unfit to be kept in existence because of their position and surroundings.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY thought that if the word "structurally" was added before "unsuitable," it would do away with the glimmer of hope that the clause might cover an insanitary place. He was advised that the word "structurally" would not cover a building which was insanitary. It seemed to him badly drafted if that was so.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: There is no such doubt as the noble Marquess anticipates. The drains are part of the structure.

On Question, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 124; Not-Contents, 38.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.
Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry*) (*L. President*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal*)

Argyll, D.
Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond and Gordon, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn*)
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Camden, M.
Exeter, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.

Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain*)
Bathurst, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Coventry, E.
Cromer, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Derby, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*)
Drogheda, E.
Eldon, E.
Feversham, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Kimberley, E.

Lathom, E.
Londesborough, E.
Lytton, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mayo, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller*]
Westmeath, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Falmouth, V.

Halifax, V.
Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*
Knutsford, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Landaff, L. Bp.
Ripon, L. Bp.

Alington, L.
Allerton, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Balfour, L. [*Teller*]
Barnard, L.
Bellew, L.
Belper, L.
Bolton, L.
Braye, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton*)
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath*)
Cheylesmore, L.

Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
Deramore, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow*)
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall*)
Glanusk, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L.
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hylton, L.
James, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll*)
Kinnaird, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore*)
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, L.

Macnaghten, L.
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham*)
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Newton, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Raglan, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Rossmore, L.
Sherborne, L.
Sinclair, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Tredegar, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss*)
Wenlock, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Ripon, M.

Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller*]
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.
Temple, E.

Cobham, V.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen*)

Peel, V.

Bath and Wells, L. Bp.
Hereford, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. David's, L. Bp.
Biddulph, L.
Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L.
Davey, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller*]

Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*)
Farrer, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly*)
Monkswell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery*)
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran*)
Thring, L.
Welby, L.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY moved as an Amendment to omit the provision by which the power to refuse a licence on the ground of non-requirement should only be exercised by quarter sessions "on a reference from the justices" of the licensing district. This Bill abolished the authority of brewster sessions to close public-houses in all cases except for misconduct or structural insufficiency, and brewster sessions were left in the position of being entitled only to make representations. He held that it was important that it should be possible for the Court of first instance to have its attention called to districts where the local bench might not be in favour of a reduction in the number of licences. They had been told in the course of the speeches on the Second Reading that the great advantage of this clause was that it substituted the dispassionate, wide intelligence of quarter sessions for the possible fanaticism and eccentricity of brewster sessions, who, it seemed to be suggested, might possibly be temperance cranks. He thought it quite as possible that there might be alcoholic cranks. There were cases where the local justices were so completely in sympathy with the publican interest that they took no initiative to reduce the number of public-houses at all. He thought, therefore, that it was necessary that in these sweeping changes, which greatly diminished the power of closing public-houses, they should give this initiative to the body in whom the Government had displayed so much confidence. He had never set up brewster sessions as an idol of worship, and was not now knocking it down. Personally, if he was to have an idol to worship, he would have something more popular and more representative than brewster sessions. But it was one thing to have a body which was not satisfactory, and another thing to have a body with less power and less efficiency substituted for it. He believed that the existing law was less imperfect than that which the Government proposed to substitute for it. The only thing he asked was that where brewster sessions were torpid quarter sessions should be able by representations to deal with the matter. He wanted the people who felt they were oppressed by an excessive number of public-houses to be able to bring the matter before quarter sessions, whether those locally in charge were with them or not.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, lines 11 and 12, to leave out the words 'on a reference from those justices and'"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I confess I am rather surprised to hear the line of argument adopted by the noble Lord who has just sat down proceeding from that side of the House. The last time I had the honour of addressing your Lordships I endeavoured to persuade noble Lords opposite that it was not the intention of His Majesty's Government to do anything to impair the authority or the discretion of licensing justices in brewster sessions assembled. I think it has been said more than once on that side of the House that nobody can possibly be better acquainted with the requirements of the locality than a petty sessional bench, and certainly I think it would be very undesirable that we should make so great a change in the existing law and practice as is proposed by the noble Lord. The whole idea and object of the Government has been to keep the existing law and practice as closely as possible to what it is at present. The changes that are made in the law are simply made in order to carry out the principle of compensation or indemnity, and in order that a body like quarter sessions, covering, as it does, a very large area, may have at its disposal a fund sufficient to effect a large measure of compensation. The noble Lord opposite seems to forget that in his hypothetical area, where the local magistrates are all the creatures and the tools of the brewer and the publicans——

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: It is quite enough if a majority are.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: Even where the majority are there will always be the right of the individual objecting to a renewal to appear before the licensing justices and bring all his efforts to bear to get the renewal of the licence included in the category of those to be represented to quarter sessions. I am sorry I am unable to accept the Amendment.

LORD BURGHCLERE said he did not read the Amendment of his noble friend quite in the same way as the noble Earl had read it. He believed that it would remedy one of the defects in the machinery of the Bill which he (Lord Burghclere) called attention to on the Second Reading. As he understood the Amendment, it brought in the opinion of the inhabitants of the locality, and, therefore, instead of limiting the force of local opinion the Amendment absolutely strengthened it. The noble Earl had said that under the Bill the inhabitants of a district would be able to bring pressure upon brewster sessions, and brewster sessions would then report to quarter sessions as indicated under the Bill. Might he ask in what part of the Bill that provision came in?

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: If I said that was so under the Bill, it was a slip of the tongue. I meant by the existing law as it stood.

LORD BURGHCLERE said that was his point. Was he to understand that, notwithstanding this Bill, and notwithstanding the distinct alteration of the law with regard to the renewal of licences by brewster sessions, the existing law so far operated that the inhabitants of a locality were able to bring a matter before brewster sessions exactly in the same manner as under the existing law? If that was so, it removed some of his objections; but he still supported the Amendment for the reason he had stated. If they were going to give these powers to quarter sessions they ought also to give quarter sessions power to themselves initiate the non-renewal of the licences of certain public-houses. There might be a local bench opposed, for some reason or another, to the non-renewal of the licences of certain superfluous houses. Parliament should, therefore, add to the wider power of quarter sessions the power of initiative, which, he thought, ought to have been given in the Bill. That was the intention of the Amendment, and he thought it so desirable that if his noble friend went to a division he would support him.

***Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY** asked whether he correctly understood the noble Earl to say that any man who objected could bring his objection before quarter sessions.

Lord BELPER: Under the Bill the initiatory power is given to the local authority. If I have heard criticism with regard to what the Government has done in this matter it is not that they have not trusted the local bench enough, but that they have not left in their hands the whole of the powers they previously possessed. We think that if a scheme is to be brought up for dealing with licences within a district it ought to be brought up by the local bench, who know the circumstances, and then quarter sessions will act on their suggestions. We do not think that you ought to so far distrust the local bench as to give quarter sessions the power of bringing forward proposals for the reduction of licences in cases where the local bench do not think reductions necessary. In that we are carrying out what is the principle of the Bill. We wish to give all discretion to the local bench to initiate these proposals and to deal with them by making their recommendations to quarter sessions; but, of course, it is clear that quarter sessions must have the power of dealing with them finally, because it may be part of the scheme for a whole county which they will have to decide. We are not prepared to accept an Amendment which will give initiatory powers to quarter sessions.

***The Earl of CREWE** said the answer of the noble Lord was exceedingly clear, so far as it went, but it did not give, in answer to the question of his noble friend behind him, any further explanation of what was said by the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. What they wanted to know was, who were the persons who, independently of brewster sessions, were to bring these cases before the licensing committee, as stated by the noble Earl.

***The LORD BISHOP of HEREFORD** asked whether, as the Bill stood, a reference from the justices included a reference by a minority of the justices.

Lord BELPER: The bench.

The LORD BISHOP of HEREFORD asked whether, if it only included a reference of the majority of the justices, it did not constitute a very strong argument in favour of the Amendment. The Bill took away the power of positive action on the part of the licensing justices, but it left them a veto as against the opinion of the neighbourhood, if they themselves wished to do nothing.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I hope your Lordships will not press this to a division. Let the House remember that there is only a limited sum of compensation money available. I do not know, of course, and it would be presumptuous in me to foreshadow, what procedure the committee of quarter sessions will adopt; but, for example, let us say that they will allot their compensation money roughly according to the population of the various petty sessional districts which they have under their jurisdiction. Well, what it will amount to in that case is that there will be a certain sum of money available for dealing with public-houses in a particular petty sessional district. The justices of that petty sessional district are, we will say, an energetic body of men devoted to temperance form. They have gone very carefully through their district, and propose to rearrange the distribution of licences according to a plan of their own. If that be their wish, then to have quarter sessions coming down suddenly in the middle of it and saying, "Oh, no! We are not going to wait for your recommendations; we do not approve of your scheme; we will not even consider it; we will come down on our own account and deal with what licences we think fit in your petty sessional district." I think that would be superseding the local justices; and noble Lords will feel that that would be a very serious interference with the proper right, as we think, of brewster sessions to have their complete recommendations put before quarter sessions before they act. That is what the Bill provides, and if your Lordships will read the latter part of the clause you will see that we propose that obligation shall be laid on quarter sessions to consider all the reports which reach them before they come to any decision. Our idea is that each brewster sessions should send up their full recommendations, and then quarter sessions should decide; but if the Amendment is approved there will be no security of that. You will have quarter sessions using up the compensation money without considering the wishes of the local authority, and that will defeat the principle of the Bill which we are deeply pledged to in the House of Commons.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said the statement of the noble Marquess seemed to him to be rather a serious one. He gathered from it that the compensation money which was given to the county would probably be distributed by quarter sessions among the different petty sessional divisions of the county.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Marquess. I did not say that at all; but in order to bring my point clearly before the House it was necessary to give a concrete example.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said he certainly misunderstood the noble Marquess. He was going to say that that was only aggravating the difficulty which many of them thought existed in the Bill as it stood. It would have been very much better, instead of tying up compensation money in different counties, if it had been made national compensation money. The effect of the arrangement the Bill proposed would be, no doubt, to prevent many large cities, where a diminution in the number of licences was extremely desirable and desired by everybody, from spending as much money as they might if the arrangement was a national one. At the same time there would be many counties not needing the whole of the compensation money who would be piling up balances which might be most usefully employed in the larger towns.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I quite agree.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said he was glad the noble Marquess agreed with that, and that his mistake had elicited that statement from the noble Marquess.

THE EARL OF CARLISLE said there was a precedent for the Amendment. The licensing committee of the county of Surrey drew the attention of the Farnham magistrates to the congestion of public-houses in their district, and that was followed by rather important results. If quarter sessions had power to intervene in this way, he did not think they would intervene in a brewster sessional district where an elaborate arrangement had been made, but only in cases where brewster sessions took no steps to act under the Bill—a thing which was very likely to happen owing to the great discouragement that had been given to brewster sessions by the Bill.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS said this Amendment would destroy the responsibility which now attached to the local justices, and would thus defeat the object of the mover with which he was in sympathy. He regretted that a certain amount of authority was taken away from the local justices by the Bill. This Amendment would still further diminish their authority. He understood the noble Earl to say that the committee of quarter sessions could hear other persons than the local justices, and he advised the withdrawal of the Amendment, and the insisting on the right of others than the justices to be heard before quarter sessions.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: Perhaps I may be permitted to explain. Under the existing law it is competent, whenever an application is made for the renewal of a licence, for any person to get up before the brewster sessions and say, "I object to the renewal of that licence." The brewster sessions thereupon adjourn the hearing of the case, and after due notice has been given they then hear the objection to the renewal. What I said was that this right will not be interfered with, in any way by the Bill, and that, in addition to that, there is a right in the Bill, when the matter comes before quarter sessions, not for any person to get up and say he objects to the renewal of a licence to which brewster sessions have not objected, because if they do not object it is settled, but a right for any person, if the committee of quarter sessions think fit to hear him, to be heard in opposition when quarter sessions are considering the question of confirming the renewal.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

*LORD KINNAIRD moved to amend the provision in Sub-section (2) that quarter sessions may, if they think it expedient, after hearing the persons interested in the licensed premises, unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary, give other persons an opportunity of being heard. He proposed to substitute "shall" for "may, if they think it expedient," and to leave out "unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary." He said it was doubtful whether under the Bill as it stood the public would be able to state their case before the committee of quarter sessions.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out the words 'may if they think expedient' and to insert the word 'shall'; and in lines 26 and 27, to leave out the words 'unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary.'"—(*Lord Kinnaird.*)

LORD BELPER: It is the intention that hearing should be given to both sides while leaving a discretion to the justices. This is only a discretion which a Court is usually allowed to have, and the words "unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary" are inserted to prevent a waste of time where everybody concerned is agreed. For that reason we object to the words being struck out.

EARL CARRINGTON said that under the Bill the committee must hear a licence-holder. He desired to know whether if they did not leave out the words proposed to be left out, the committee might exclude the magistrates or anybody else who wished to came forward.

The Earl of Onslow.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: No, no!

EARL CARRINGTON said if that was not the case he should like to have the matter explained to him.

LORD BELPER: I will read the clause as it is: "After giving the persons interested in the licensed premises, and, unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary, any other persons appearing to them to be interested in the question of the renewal of the licence of those premises, an opportunity of being heard." Therefore the words proposed by the noble Lord are unnecessary.

EARL CARRINGTON: Then, besides the licensee, they may hear any other person?

LORD BELPER: Certainly.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY observed that persons interested in the licence were heard as right. Would persons who thought the licence unnecessary be heard against the granting of the licence? Taking the illustration of the rule *nisi*, in that case it was not necessary to hear the parties on the other side, because the Court were not going to grant a rule against the person who was asking for it. But if the Court were going to grant a licence in favour of a certain person who had been heard, it was necessary that the party on the other side should be heard. So long as that was clearly expressed in the words they had all they desired.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think I can show why it would be impossible for us to accept these words. Of course, the object of the Bill is that all the persons who ought to be heard shall be heard. In order to carry that out we have to use very wide words. You cannot very well have wider words than those which are in the lines of the clause which provide that quarter sessions may hear any persons appearing to them to be interested in the question of the renewal of the licence of the premises. That may include anybody in the whole of England. I do not see how we could make them narrower. The only course open to the Government was to put the discretionary power in quarter sessions to say whether they thought it was proper that any particular persons should be heard. It must be remembered that any prolonged hearing means expense, and the Government have been throughout most anxious to avoid expense, for this reason, that all the expenses come out of the compensation fund, and therefore if we multiply checks of all sorts and force a most elaborate procedure on them, I am afraid the result would be that there would be a serious infringement of the compensation fund. Every halfpenny taken out of that fund means a less opportunity of getting rid of unnecessary licences. Therefore, I hope the noble Lord will not press it. The hearing must be limited in some way or other, and I think to place the limit in the discretion of the quarter sessions is the most workmanlike procedure.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said he apprehended that what the noble Marquess meant was that all persons should be heard, whether in favour of renewal or against, whom it was desirable to hear.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: That is so.

EARL CARRINGTON suggested that if their Lordships would agree to accept Lord Stanley of Alderley's next Amendment, that would effect the desired purpose.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY remarked that in one case in which he was interested he desired to be heard against an appeal to quarter sessions, but he was informed that nobody could appear in person but only by counsel. That involved considerable expense, which he declined to bear, and therefore the appeal was allowed and the licence granted.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY moved, in page 1, line 28, after the word "renewal" to insert the words "or refusal." He pointed out that a person interested in the renewal was interested in getting a licence, and he desired that a person who wished to oppose the granting of a licence should also be heard. When he was at the School Board they took a very active part in opposing licenses because they felt it very undesirable to have licensed premises close to a school. Whenever a new licence was applied for they gave instructions where the premises were objectionably near a school to oppose the granting. Such bodies were persons interested in the matter, and after the explanations which had been given he thought that if the words he proposed were inserted they would get substantially what was wanted.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 28, after the word 'renewal' to insert the words 'or refusal.'"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I cannot understand how a person interested in the question of renewal would not include a person interested in the question of there not being a renewal. It seems to me quite clear, but if it seems to the noble Lord that adding the words "or refusal" would make it more clear, I am quite willing to accept these words, subject to the caution that I would like to inquire into the matter more carefully, and, if I find that the words do more than I and the noble Lord suppose, that we should have the right to bring forward such alteration as we think fit on the Report stage.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD COLERIDGE moved an Amendment in page 2, line 1, after the word "premises" to insert "and the justices." He said this might seem to be unnecessary after the remarks which had fallen from the Government. As he read the Bill originally it seemed to him that the words "interested in the question of the renewal of the licence" might not apply to the justices. He was not at all sure that they would. How were the justices interested in the refusal or renewal of a licence? If they were not represented in the Court above, and had no power of being heard or represented in the Court above, the Court above would never be seized of the reasons actuating the justices in their decision, or be enabled to properly agree or disagree with them on any fresh facts which might be found. It seemed to him that the clause was very ambiguous. The noble Marquess might have taken legal advice, but he (Lord Coleridge) doubted whether the Bill provided for the justices appearing to support their own recommendations.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 1, after the word 'premises to insert the words, 'and the justices.' "—(*Lord Coleridge*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Lord is correct. I have taken legal advice on this subject and I am advised that the justices would be included and are intended to be included in the words, "other persons interested in the question of the renewal." According to the English language it is very difficult to believe that they would be excluded, and I can assure the noble and learned Lord that there is no intention whatever of excluding the justices. Indeed, if he looks at Clause 6 he will find there powers taken for consulting the justices. The Government do not desire to meet every Amendment with a direct negative, and if the noble and learned Lord thinks it would make it clearer to put in the justices we shall not prevent it. But I hope he will not ask us to put in too many things of this sort, for there is a danger in our specifying any particular case of excluding others which we do not want to exclude.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY inquired whether the Amendment was not governed by the limitation on page 1, unless it appears to quarter sessions unnecessary." He did not think it was likely that quarter sessions would refuse to hear the magistrates.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I understand that these words should properly come in after the word "person" on page 1 and before the words "including the justices." I am not sure whether we have not passed that point.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH): We have done so.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: We will consider the matter, and, if necessary, insert an Amendment on Report.

LORD COLERIDGE said that in spite of the remarks of the noble Marquess, he had intended to add also words providing that the quarter sessions might hear the local authority of the area in which the licensed premises were situated. Was he correct in understanding that such an appearance would be legitimate as coming in under the phrase "any other persons appearing to them to be interested in the question of the renewal of the licence."

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Yes.

LORD COLERIDGE said in that case he should not propose the words he suggested.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I only desire to make this observation. The noble and learned Lord must be very familiar with a rule of law (which I am afraid to put into Latin because I might not be successful) which says that if you specifically mention certain things you merely exclude a great many other things. If we mentioned a whole category of persons who are specially to be admitted to a hearing, we should possibly exclude a great many others who ought to be included. Justices are in a special case because of their historical position in regard to licensing, and I hope the noble and learned Lord will not press the Amendment.

LORD COLERIDGE intimated that he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said that notwithstanding the very high importance of the matter involved in the additional clause which he desired to see inserted in the Bill, and the wide attention that was being directed to the subject outside their Lordships' House, he felt exonerated in some degree from trespassing on their time at any great length inasmuch as the question of a time limit was in its general aspect dealt with on Monday and Tuesday last in the discussion which took place on the Amendment moved by the noble and learned Lord Peel, when he objected to any such Parliamentary action as would create a perpetual interest in a terminable licence. That view was exactly expressed in the clause which he proposed to move, though of course he must enter with more detail into the manner in which it should be carried out. Lord Belper, speaking on behalf of the Government the other day, surprised him and many others by saying that the Bill as a matter of fact did not, do this very thing of creating a perpetual interest in a terminable licence.

LORD BELPER: I only said that was my own opinion.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said he could only apply to the speech of the noble Lord a quotation from a recent speech of Viscount Goschen, namely, *splendide audax*. He could not literally understand how it could be contended that a man who held legally only a licence which must be renewed annually, and who was open to have it refused without compensation at any time was in no way given a fresh interest of a valuable sort if he was placed in a position of absolute legal security. How could it be contended that this did not create a perpetual interest in a terminable licence. The noble Lord said he thought it did not. He was trying to do in one way which seemed to him to be fair and reasonable, what the noble Lord was trying to do in another way, namely, establish a plan for giving what had been described in several ways as an indemnity, a compensation, or a *solatium*. He desired to say in the most emphatic way that he was as anxious as any of their Lordships could be that these men should receive some compensation for the loss of the monetary interest which had grown up in connection with every license. He had no sympathy whatever with those who were described by the noble Marquess a few nights ago in a tone as if it would include most of them—as those who desired to bring the holding of licences to an end and stop the trade altogether. He had no sympathies of that kind at all. His proposal in this clause was one which he believed to be perfectly sound in the interests of the community, and absolutely fair as regarded the persons immediately affected.

The Prime Minister had more than once reiterated his belief that the proper principle, if they were dealing with the question afresh and on a clean slate, would be that the monopoly value—if such were the correct phrase—or quasi-monopoly value given by the possessor of a licence should only be given when the value of the monopoly was retained by the State and paid for by the man who acquired it. Effectiveness was given to that opinion by the change which the Government had made by introducing into Clause 4 a scheme of new licences which, presumably, they regarded as the right kind of plan on which, if they had a free hand, they should desire all licences to have been held from the first and to be held now. His proposal was to make that plan work consistently for all kinds of licences all the land over when the necessary time for winding up the existing condition of things had elapsed. He did not think it was necessary to explain his proposal in detail, for it spoke for itself, but some of its provisions seemed to have puzzled his friends a little. The words in the clause he proposed would result in this, that for fourteen years the licence would run exactly as the Bill proposed, the holders of licences paying such compensation levy which the magistrates might decide upon within certain limits, and receiving compensation if their licences were withdrawn at any time. That would go on for fourteen years. Then at the end of that time, by which time he hoped and believed that a great deal would have been effected, and the worst of the licences suppressed or withdrawn—specially would that be the case with regard to the ante-1869 beerhouses—there would be a period of seven years—a halcyon period of security during which there would be no power of compulsory withdrawal of licences, and, on the other hand, no call to pay a compensation levy, such levy would not be required, as there would be no power to disturb the existing holders of licences. After that time, that is to say twenty-one years from the passing of the Act, there would be a new start altogether upon the exact lines which the Government had itself proposed for new licences and new licensees—the principle that the monopoly value did belong to the State, and that if it was acquired by any individual he should have to pay for it. It would not be possible that the change could take place at one particular moment all the land over, because there would, if the Bill became an Act exactly upon its present lines, be an overlapping of leases granted for seven years or less, which would not have been terminated. It was impossible to say that there should be one precise moment at which it should happen all the land over, but he imagined that magistrates, who knew that the time was going to arrive, would endeavour in giving their leases or periods to the licensees so to arrange matters as to make things terminate practically at the same time.

What were the gains of such a proposal? First, there would be the ultimate resumption by the community of the monopoly value—he used the words with reserve, because he did not think they were quite correct—which the community or the State had given. That was the principle which the Government had applied to new licences, and he would apply it to old licences as well. Secondly, his proposal would result in a great simplification of what was at present an exceedingly complicated system. It would unify the method for the whole system of licence administration and would get rid of the complications which now arose from the existing rights and privileges, and expectations, and the rest. Then it would give back to the community—and personally be attached to this the greatest importance of all—the freedom which they did not now possess of making experiments in the way of licensing reform—a possibility which would be greater twenty-one years hence than now. Their Lordships were all familiar with Lord Grey's proposals. It might be that a great number of other suggestions or proposals which local communities might take up if they had a free hand would be put into action, and his proposal would set men free to act.

Then he asked would the scheme press hardly upon anybody, and, if so, upon whom? Let them take first the condition of the ordinary licence-holder who held a full licence, who was now an annual tenant so far as the strict technical law went, but who practically had an interest which they all desired to see compensated, and which had arisen from the manner in which the law had been administered for many years. The Bill compensated—unfortunately he thought—in an increasing amount the holders of these licences if they were to be dispossessed. The abolition of licences would increase the value of those which remained, and those licences if they were ultimately suppressed would be suppressed at a higher compensation value, although in the interim their profit-making would have been higher. His proposal, however, on the contrary, was that for fourteen years these men should be paying the levy and receiving the compensation if dispossessed; that for seven years they should have absolute security and no levy, and in that period they would be able to make a golden harvest—the result, in part at least, of other suppressions having taken place. Then at last after twenty-one years all would come to an end, and they should start again on the principle laid down by Clause 4 of the Government Bill. During those twenty-one years surely it would be possible for any man of prudence and foresight to make such financial arrangements as would enable him at the close of that period to arrange for the payment of the sum required of him in return for a new licence. This might either be a lump sum paid for the acquisition of new rights or it might be an annual contribution which he would be called upon to pay by reason of the monopoly value of the licence which he was to hold from the State. He could not see how a man so circumstanced could be under any hardship, and he believed his scheme would work with absolute fairness both to the individual, to the community, and to the State.

The same arguments he applied to the position of the ante-1869 licences. The holder of one of those licences would have fourteen years compensation if he was dispossessed—a higher rate because of the security which he now enjoyed—and he would be treated with greater consideration. Then if he were not dispossessed during that period he would throughout that time have been enabled to gain a largely increased profit because of the suppression of his rivals and competitors. To him also would be given the seven years of golden harvest, during which he would be freed from dispossession and payment of the levy. Even if they allowed that there would be some falling off in the gross receipts in that neighbourhood, the increase of profit must be considerably larger than would possibly be required of the holder of the licence in the form of the compensation levy which was to be obtained from him.

They were told that if they had a time limit they ought to compensate the licence-holder from public funds and not from the trade. They were making the compensation come from the trade by means of a compulsory tax. But it was a trade whose profits would be considerably enhanced by what had been occurring all the while and by the fact that Parliament had suppressed the more formidable of their rivals. Again, they were told that the 1869 licence-holder had a statutory right and that they must not interfere with it. As regards Parliamentary interference with existing rights or supposed rights, they had been reminded again and again by the Prime Minister and some representatives of the Government in that House that it was impossible to think of fettering the power of Parliament to deal at any time as it thought fit with the licensing question. He should like to ask what was the statutory right which the ante-1869 beerhouse licences really possessed, and which was so sacred that they must take care not to interfere with it? What happened in 1869? Up to that time unrestricted licensing had prevailed. The restrictions which came in at that time gave incidentally as a gift to the man who remained over when the restrictions had been removed an increased value attaching to his licence, and from that time those men had been irremovable except for reasons which were specially and definitely mentioned. But did this give them a "statutory" right to full compensation if his trade were injured? Suppose that Parliament should decide on allowing free trade in liquor all round, and that all the neighbours of an ante-1869 beerhouse-keeper were allowed to sell liquor, should they compensate that man because they had destroyed his trade by allowing others to compete? They would say that it was the fortune of war, that public changes had taken place in the public interest, although he (the most rev. Primate) did not at all think it would be in the public interest. Should they say he was entitled to compensation, and if not, why should they say he was, in consequence of the change now made, entitled to anything more than the reasonable consideration which was proposed under this clause? If they gave a man time to recoup his outlay it was impossible to say he would be suffering under any hardship under the change now proposed. Under the Government scheme for new licences, as described in Clause 4, it was apparently anticipated that by giving a man seven years they would enable him to recoup the outlay to which he had been put, and to make a profit. Under his proposal they would give a man twenty-one years instead of seven during which to make such arrangements as would meet the changed condition of things which would result when the twenty-one years were over. During that time he would be holding the monopoly value practically for nothing, it having come to him not by the deliberate intention of Parliament, but incidentally. It was practically a gift to him or his predecessor when the changes were originally made.

He had endeavoured to show that no real grievance could be alleged if they were to bring about that which on public grounds most of them felt to be a beneficent thing, namely, to start afresh at the end of twenty-one years without the complications which hung round their necks to-day. It was alleged fairly enough that a time limit, if imposed, would to some extent restrict the borrowing power of the publican or licence-holder, either now or later. Undoubtedly the man who now received a permanent interest in his premises would very easily find people to lend money upon it. The man could say, "I have a permanent interest; I wish to borrow on it. I have entered into all kinds of obligations because I have a permanent Parliament given security, and therefore I have borrowed a large amount upon it." The time limit would undoubtedly hinder that to some extent, but he did not think that such power of borrowing would be a good thing. Again, they were told that this would restrict the borrowing power of local authorities, and a great deal had been made of the power which the local authority would have to borrow to a large extent because of the security it had in the permanent levy or tax upon all licensed premises. Undoubtedly if that local levy were to come to an end after fourteen years, the local authorities would borrow less than now. In his opinion, that restriction of borrowing powers would be a good thing. It was not an advantage that the licensing authority should be able, because it was in an enthusiastic mood and desired hastily to abolish very costly licensed premises, to use up the money which, years after, might be wanted. He knew that a loan had to receive the approval of the Secretary of State, but, in his view, nothing would be more disadvantageous than that the local authorities should be encouraged to borrow too large amounts, and practically tie the hands and leave helpless their successors for many years to come in the discharge of their magisterial functions. The fourteen years levy would be a wholesome restriction on the borrowing powers. In any case he personally preferred a lesser reduction for a time if so be, provided that it were with the knowledge that they would have full freedom to recover the monopoly for the community after a certain number of years had passed. Even if that involved less reduction during the next decade, he should not regret it if it meant that in the end they would have that freedom put into the hands of those to whom it ought properly to belong. He urged they should do nothing to tie the hands of their successors in the administration of these matters. It was said that Parliament could not tie the hands of their successors, but by the Bill they were giving to these people a compensation which enabled them to borrow on their permanent security in the licence, and they would find these people saying later that Parliament had no right to do that unless it was intended to compensate them, or to make some arrangement to get them out of the difficulties into which they had landed themselves.

He hoped he had answered to some extent the objection that after twenty-one years they would be involved in the same difficulties as those of to-day. His answer was that, by taking the Government's plan with regard to new licences, and applying it to the other licences, those difficulties would wholly disappear. It seemed to him that his proposal would make the Bill coherent and logical as a whole, and it would be in every sense an improvement of it as a legislative measure. He was profoundly anxious to be absolutely and scrupulously fair to those whose interests were involved in any measure of this kind, and his proposal would not only be fair but even munificent to the trade. It would be generous beyond what a right in equity ever could claim. But he did not mind that, because if mistakes had been made in the past they ought to pay for them rather than let innocent individuals pay for them. Certainly they would be paying beyond what any legal obligation required, but he did not object to that because he thought the gain would be worth paying for. He believed that hundreds of the best members of the trade, and he knew for certain that some of the very best and highest members of the trade, would accept a proposal of this kind if it came to them with the authority of Parliament. Some of these men he desired to speak of with the deepest possible respect. They had the highest interests of the public at heart, and he believed that many of them would be perfectly ready to accept this suggestion and not regard it as a hardship. That some would not welcome it was probably certain, but in the long run he thought it would be found that neither the public nor the members of the trade, who were doing their work in a high and legitimate way, would be really sufferers or wronged in any way. The principle of the time limit seemed to be making a steady progress not only outside but also among many of the warmest supporters of the present Bill. He was bold enough, and rash enough, to conjecture that if they could see below the surface, in the breasts even of some of the occupants of the Government Benches in this and the other House, they would find that some of them in their hearts were in favour of it although they were afraid to deal with it at this juncture, because of the difficulty that would arise owing to the time limit in another sense which in the lower House of Parliament would render adequate discussion so difficult. If that was so he could not believe that for the sake of that temporary and passing difficulty they would allow such a consideration to result in their being bound for all time, so far as this Bill could bind them, to a system which, whatever might be said in its favour, would not really be the best for the English people.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 1, to insert the following clause, 'After the end of fourteen years from the passing of this Act existing on-licences shall not be renewed, but in place of every existing on-licence which is still in existence after the end of such period there shall be granted at the next ensuing general annual licensing meeting a new licence for the term of seven years, subject to the provisions of Section 4 of this Act, but without the imposition of any payment or conditions under Sub-section (2) of such section other than the conditions (if any) attached to the existing licence. Provided, nevertheless, that such licence may be refused on the same grounds and subject to the same terms and conditions as the renewal of the existing licence might have been refused.' "—(*The Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I confess that it is with some reluctance that I rise to oppose, as I must do, the Amendment moved with such evident sincerity and in such moderate language by such an authority in this House as the most rev. Primate. I do not doubt for one moment the interest he has in temperance reform or his desire to be fair to all parties, and I recognise that he represents, as the head of the right rev. Bench in this House, an element in your Lordships' Assembly devoted to the maintenance of principles of morality in this country, and that when he speaks officially on a moral issue he is entitled to be listened to with the most profound respect. But I am afraid, as you will expect, that the Government cannot accept this Amendment. The most rev. Primate claims it as one of the advantages of his Amendment that—as I understood him—it would not tie the hands of Parliament in the future so much as our own proposal. I think that is an argument exceedingly difficult to follow. He proposes to tie the hands of your Lordships absolutely for at least twenty-one years. He proposes that for fourteen years there should be compensation, and that for seven years more there should be fixity of tenure without compensation. But his anticipation of the liberty of Parliament goes further than that, because in the face of the sort of catastrophe which awaits the liquor trade at the end of the twenty-one years all sorts of arrangements will have to be made by them to try to save something from the wreck. If that happens and these arrangements are made it will be too late for Parliament to do justice; the arrangements will have been made, and it will then be useless to repent and say, "We did not mean to treat you so hardly as it seems we have done, and we can put it right," because the businesses will have passed into other hands and it will be wholly impossible to set right the mischief which, as I think, Parliament will have effected.

At the beginning of his speech the most rev. Primate dwelt upon the phrase that we were giving a permanent value to a terminable licence, but that is what the most rev. Primate proposes to do by this Amendment, because he proposes to pay —as the Government do—compensation to a certain number of licences during the first fourteen years. My Lords, compensation is a sum of money, and that has a permanent value and must have. It is a terminable licence, but the lucky licensees —lucky because they will be at the mercy of the most rev. Primate instead of being exposed to his vengeance—will get a permanent value for their terminable licences. That brings me to the first objection to that Amendment. My Lords, contrast the position of the licensee whose licence is put an end to in the fourteenth year with that of the licensee whose licence is put an end to after the twenty-first year. In the fourteenth year he will receive full compensation on the principle that he is to receive the difference between the value of the premises as licensed and unlicensed. But in the twenty-first year he is to receive nothing, but is to be turned out without compensation. How can anyone defend the justice of that proposal? It is that inequity of differential treatment in the amount of money between man and man who are in exactly the same circumstances which is always rightly resented by the victims of such a position. The most rev. Primate, like many other speakers, has referred to the enormous gains which the liquor trade has made in recent years. Of course they have made enormous gains, but it is sometimes forgotten that the people who are to be affected by your legislation are not always the people who make the enormous gains. On the contrary, take the case of an ordinary licensee at the present time. He has probably paid an enormous sum for the goodwill of his business. Does the most rev. Primate think that he makes a large profit? If he does, he is very much misinformed, for I am sure that a great many of them make very little profit indeed. To treat them badly is not to treat a rich man badly, but a poor man badly. Take again the liquor trade generally. I think I heard noble Lords the other night speak with a certain amount of contumely of the great limited companies which had taken over breweries. Well, my Lords, those who now own the shares in these brewery companies have given a very high price for them. They have not made a large sum of money—they have not made enormous gains. I know of a particular brewery the shares of which, shortly after it was converted into a limited company, were put on the market and fell enormously in value. How can it be said that these unfortunate shareholders are the plutocrats into whose pockets we may dip our hands without doing any great harm. I am sure that part of the case has not impressed itself upon the most rev. Primate.

How are people affected by this Amendment to protect themselves against the ultimate losses which may fall upon them? For fourteen years they will receive compensation and for seven years they will receive security. But after that time how are they to protect themselves? No voluntary scheme of insurance will be possible for them. I hope your Lordships will appreciate that. It is quite clear that in the temper which characterises certain influential temperance reformers it would be impossible for a licensee who finds himself in their unfortunate district to protect himself at all, because he would be aware that as soon as the restrictions which Parliament had imposed on the taking away of his licence without compensation were removed, he would only have an even chance that he would be allowed to go on at all. That is not an exaggeration. The noble Viscount said the other night that 50 per cent. of the licences ought to be destroyed, so that at the end of twenty-one years every licensee would know that he would have an even chance of being allowed to go on or be destroyed. Is it possible to conceive any scheme of voluntary insurance likely to meet a case such as that? The noble Viscount is not singular in this respect. There are many others who held as extreme opinions as the noble Viscount and also a great many magistrates, and these people would place the licensees in such a position that they would be absolutely unable to insure themselves against the loss which they might incur. But the matter goes further than that. It is not certain that there would be an even chance that the licensee would retain or lose his vested interest, but it would be certain that he would lose what is called the monopoly value. I do not defend the system of monopoly value; I have always thought it outrageous, and the Government are going to try to put an end to it with regard to all future licences. But with regard to existing licences that monopoly value has been given to the licensees and to the liquor trade. The present holders have paid every halfpenny for it when they bought the shares or the goodwill of the licensed premises. Therefore if they were deprived of the monopoly value it is absolute pillage—it is robbing them of what they have paid for. There will be no chance of their protecting themselves against that loss, because it is not an even chance that they will retain the monopoly value, but it is quite certain that under the Amendment every halfpenny of that element in their property will be taken away. Therefore, I cannot but say that the proposal, although it is, if I may so with respect, beautifully dressed up, does amount to nothing more than pillage of what belongs to those who are interested in this trade.

That is going to be done in the face of a distinct Parliamentary promise .One-third of the licensed houses in England are built upon a Parliamentary title. It is not a question of a practice which has grown up—it is to be found within the four corners of an Act of Parliament passed many years ago. They are held absolutely during good behaviour, according to the four conditions, and yet these people are to be exposed to this pillage at the hands of Parliament. I put their case highest, of course, but I think the title of other licence-holders is almost as good. I confess that, when we reflect how they have bought and sold their interest with the knowledge and with the consent of Parliament, their title is almost as good. Parliament might have interfered long ago if it had been thought proper to deny the licensees this right; but Parliament did not do that. It sanctioned the right by taxing them on the full value of their premises. Therefore it would be quite impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment..

I come now, my Lords, to the parallel which has been drawn between existing licences and the new licences. The new licences to which the procedure of Clause 4 is adapted stand upon a totally different footing. The new licences will have no monopoly value till you have granted them. Therefore, if you make it one of the conditions of the licenses that they shall have no monopoly value, you can take nothing away from them, and the new licensee need not take his licence unless he likes. But that is a very different case from that of the old licences. The old licensee has his licence and cannot get out of it without loss. It is to be presumed that there are no such sweeping, drastic changes threatened against the new licence-holder as are threatened against the old licence-holder. Even the noble Viscount would not propose to take away 50 per cent. of the new licences, because it is to be presumed that they will only be granted where they are absolutely wanted, and therefore they are not exposed to any great risk. The man who receives a new licence may properly assume that he will be allowed to keep it. He may say, "In face of the strong feeling in favour of temperance reform, if I was allowed to have a licence I should be allowed to keep it." He would not have that 50 per cent. chance against his being allowed to do so. So that in the three most radical particulars the new licensee stands on a totally different footing to the old licensee. To try and show that because the thing is fair under Clause 4 to new licensees it is therefore fair to old licensees is to ignore all the true elements of the situation. My Lords, I think I have said enough to show why the Government cannot accept this Amendment. I feel inclined to indulge in a few protestations. The noble Lord, Earl Crewe, the other night took the Government to task because we did not give utterance to more of the phrases that we were in favour of temperance reform. I should think that it went without saying that there is not one of your Lordships who is not in favour of temperance reform if it can be achieved with justice. We hold that the Bill will do something to secure temperance reform, but we have never put too high a faith in legislation. We will do what we can in justice with legislation, but we rely far more upon that steady progress of public opinion towards temperance which we see around us. We believe that is far more effective than any legislation you can introduce and is far more to be relied upon than any expedient which we cannot reconcile to the elementary requirements of justice. For these reasons, my Lords, it is impossible for the Government to accept the most rev. Primate's Amendment.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said that anyone who had listened to the speech of the noble Marquess without knowing the subject which was under debate would have supposed that the most rev. Primate was engaged in pillage—he thought that was a very strong word for the noble Marquess to have used—of property, in the ordinary sense of the word, of some unfortunate persons in this country. It was essentially necessary in this discussion that they should bear constantly in mind what was the nature of the matter with which they were dealing. What was the nature of the interest which licence-holders really possessed? Great exception had been taken by the Government to those who had said that the Bill before them would confer a freehold for the future upon the holders of existing licences. He was not going to say that was so for the reason that freehold had a connection with property, and property so-called did not exist in the case with which they were dealing. He was not opposed to the granting to holders of existing licences what had been called by a variety of names, of which he would take the last mentioned by the most rev. Primate and say a *solatium*, to the holders of these licences.

What were the facts? The licences under the existing law were granted from year to year and there was no obligation—no legal obligation—upon the brewster sessions to renew those licences if they did not think fit to do so. The noble Lord, Lord Belper, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill told them that it had been the general feeling of brewster sessions that they were not entitled to refuse the renewal of a licence, except, of course, in cases of certain offences, upon the ground that there were more public-houses in the district than were required, and that it would be to the public interest that the licences should be withheld. Those benches of magistrates were obviously ill advised by their clerks, because the law had been declared to be different. What he was anxious to point out was that they were not dealing in this case with a set of ignorant persons who did not know what the law was. If the old system had been in existence now, and if the holders of licences had been men dwelling in their own houses and conducting their businesses with their own capital, they would have had no legal right but a very much stronger claim to compassionate consideration, because it might be said with truth that they might have been ignorant of the real state of the law, and under the same misconception of the nature of the law as the noble Lord, Lord Belper, said a great number of the magistrates and brewster sessions had been. But they were not dealing with ignorant people, nor with poor people; they were dealing with a very rich and powerful trade. Was it possible to suppose that men of that sort, having plenty of money at their command, and able to get the best legal opinion in the country, could have been ignorant of the real nature of the tenure by which their licences were held? It was inconceivable that they did not know what their position was after the decision in the case of "Sharp *v.* Wakefield." That decision was twelve years old, while there was another decision previous to that date which tended in the same direction. But he would stand upon "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" and say that it was impossible to believe that the rich holders of 90 per cent. of the licences had not known for those twelve years what was the tenure on which they held them. During those twelve years the value of their property had grown—to use a familiar phrase it had grown by leaps and bounds and grown in spite of the character of the tenure of which they were perfectly aware. It was useless for the Government to talk of pillage—there was no pillage in the matter.

He was not prepared to deny that, those licences having been held for a long period, during a portion of which there might have been some misconception as to the tenure, some consideration or form of *solatium* should be given to those who held them if it should be considered desirable in the public interest to refuse them on any general public grounds. But he was not willing to go beyond that. To talk of the licences as if they were property of a real and substantial character which could not be dealt with by Parliament except by the same sort of compensation as they gave to a landowner when a railway was given power to take his land, was altogether wrong. That was not the true state of the case, and the argument was not improved in the least by exaggerating it to the extreme extent to which it had been exaggerated by the Lord Privy Seal.

Then they were told that a time limit was unjust because these persons were entitled to compensation. They were not legally entitled to compensation. They would receive compensation, and he should vote for it being given to them on reasonable terms, but when the most rev. Primate asked them to limit the compensation to a period of fourteen years and afterwards to give an additional security to the licence-holder for seven years, to call that pillage was wrong, and he could only say he thought the most rev. Primate had been very generous in his proposal. For his own part he should not have objected if the most rev. Primate had exercised his generosity less strongly. They were told that the compensation was to come out of the pockets of the trade. Of course literally that was true, but it was to be raised by a public tax, and if their Lordships had in mind the admirable speech of the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London on Tuesday and the example he gave from the United States of the revenue raised from licences in that country, they would see that by paying this compensation in the form suggested they were really limiting the amount which the public might perfectly well raise from the licences by taxation, and that they were therefore practically making the public pay the compensation. He was a little amused the other night by one of the members of the Government—he was not sure it was not the President of the Board of Agriculture—saying that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been considering how he could get more money and what were the sources of taxation to which he might turn, and that he had never proposed to put an increased tax upon licences. He was not at all surprised to hear that. It was exactly what he should have expected. But that argument was not conclusive to him, and he believed a considerable sum of money might legitimately and properly be raised by taxation upon licences of a very much more stringent character than that which existed at the present time. He therefore could not but think that although in the first instance it might be that this compensation was paid by the trade, it was really paid by the public, because it tended to reduce the amount which perfectly legitimately the public, following the example of many other countries, might have obtained from licences of this kind.

He confessed himself unable to understand why it was supposed that the proposal of the most rev. Primate was inconsistent with the principle of the Bill. He did not know that that would be a very vital argument with him, although it was no doubt a very strong argument with noble Lords who sat opposite. He could not admit that it was inconsistent with the principle of the Bill. The principle of the Bill was said to be a desire to reduce licences; and the licensees were to have a sort of compassionate claim to compensation when their licences were reduced. But to say that was not to say that the compensation was to be paid to all eternity, for the only ground which really gave them any kind of claim was that they really did not understand the position in which they had stood. It seemed to him that they would be fully and entirely compensated by the grant of compensation under a time limit. The noble Marquess, following to a certain extent the statement made by the Prime Minister, seemed to indicate that Parliament would be quite free to deal with this matter as it pleased hereafter. Mr. Balfour wrote a letter to the newspapers the other day in which he explained to his correspondent, who he supposed was a person ignorant of constitutional theories, that Parliament could do whatever it liked, and if it chose after the passage of this Bill to repeal it and abolish all these licences without any compensation at all, although he thought that would be unjust, he did not think the Bill would in any way preclude Parliament from doing what it might think fit. That was true, but it was a truism; and with all respect to Mr. Arthur Balfour, they did not require to be told it by him. The truth was this, that by passing this Bill, and particularly by passing it after the speech to which they had just listened—a speech which raised the rights of licence-holders to property and talked of pillage by the most rev. Primate—by passing this Bill they would have rendered the difficulty of dealing with this question in the future much greater than it was now. He did not want their hands to be tied. By granting the licences for fourteen years, subject to a further continuance for seven years, they would meet, and more than meet, every legitimate claim of the licence-holders, and at the end of the period of twenty-one years Parliament would be placed in a position in which it could really deal with the question as it pleased and could take such steps as might be necessary towards a substantial temperance reform.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS said the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, in following the most rev. Primate drew a very pathetic picture of the position of the licensee under the

Amendment who, after fourteen years of paying premiums, would find that after all if he were deprived of his licence he would have none of the compensation to which he had been contributing. He did not think that the noble Marquess at the time said anything about the seven years which came under the Archbishop's proposed scheme, but the picture that the noble Marquess drew arrested his attention, because it was part of an argument which some weeks ago prevailed very strongly in his mind and made it appear to him absolutely impossible to accept any time limit. It seemed to him the whole position of difficulty would be realised again at the end of the allotted time, and that the difficulty of the position would be accentuated by the fact that during that period the premiums had been paid by the licensees who hoped eventually to obtain compensation if deprived of their licences. But he had been entirely converted by the arguments that had been used in favour of the Bill by many persons who had been strongly advocating it and not the least so by those who had spoken from the Government Bench, for they had impressed so strongly upon him the fact that the main purpose of this Bill was to enable those in authority to get rid of redundant licences within a reasonable period, and they made it apparently so hopeful a possibility that all the redundant licences would be got rid of in some such period as fourteen years, that it seemed to him there would be no hardship whatever to any licensee who held his licence beyond that time; because surely they did not wish to reduce the licences beyond the point at which the real needs of the people might demand that a certain number of licences should exist. If they did that they plunged themselves into a difficulty far more serious than anything they had at the present time to face. They would have, undoubtedly, then to face the difficulties of those clubs which in secret, without regulation, without inspection, would so very greatly tend to the deterioration of the morals of our people.

He remembered perfectly well the time when he was in Australia that there was started in the colony in which he lived that which was known as a large irrigation colony, and one of the principles of that colony was that there should be no licensed public-houses existing in it. What was the result? The result was that there was a great deal more secret drinking, a great deal of bad conduct in consequence, and eventually it was found that it would have been a far better thing to have had properly licensed public-houses. He did not think many of them would at all desire to see such a reduction of public-houses as would exceed the point at which they were naturally demanded by the needs of the people, and therefore, with that very strongly in his view, he could not see that there would be any hardship whatever that would accrue in the case of a licensee who should survive the period in which it had been asserted the redundant licences would practically have been got rid of. In that he should associate what he was saying as well as he might with the very eloquent words which fell from the noble Earl who, speaking from one of the Benches behind the Government Bench, with that grace and eloquence which gave such point to all the arguments that he brought forward, had claimed that if there was to be any real temperance reform they must address themselves to some such questions as that to which he had alluded, viz., the danger of the clubs.

Now he did not know, of course, what the result might be of any division that might be taken upon this Amendment of the most rev. Primate. Little as he might know about Parliamentary affairs, he could not help noticing with regard to most Acts of Parliament that they seldom seemed to come up to expectations of their friends, and they seldom seemed to realise all the apprehensions of their opponents, and he dared say it would be very much the same with this Bill when it became an Act. But if the Bill produced anything like the results which he had heard from the Government Bench its promoters expected it would produce in the reduction of redundant licences, then he wanted to urge as strongly as he could that if the Amendment were adopted there would be no hardship in the case of any licensee who, during those fourteen years, and with the seven years of grace afterwards, might have been contributing during the first fourteen a certain premium to the compensation fund, but who was not likely to be deprived of his licence because the number of redundant licences, he supposed, by that time would have disappeared. For that reason he most earnestly hoped the most rev. Primate's Amendment might be accepted and that the Government would, after all, see their way in a modified form to adopt it in the Bill.

*LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH said it was impossible not to sympathise with the words that had fallen from the most rev. Primate and those who had supported him in this Amendment, and although he spoke as an opponent he hoped he should not be wrong if he said that the idea underlying, the Amendment, namely, that the people of this country through the licensing authorities should have a free hand after a certain number of years, was deserving, at all events, of great consideration at the hands of their Lordships. Various arguments had been urged in the course of the debate against this Amendment and against the proposal for a term of years, and he thought that one of the most powerful arguments which he would not say had been unnoted, but at all events had not been very strongly urged, was that it would to a great extent hamper any future legislation that might occur after this Bill became law. In the course of this debate both in their Lordships' House and in another place it had been hinted, and that not obscurely, both by the promoters and by the opponents, that when this Bill became law the last word upon this most important question would not have been spoken. The opponents of the Bill had signified their intention very freely to do all they could to alter what they conceived to be a very bad measure. Those who supported the Bill had again on their part said that the way lay open to any future legislation should the present Bill not come up to expectations. To this it had been objected that although a future Parliament and future Government had no doubt the full legal right to alter anything which was passed now, they were not very likely to do so. How that might be he did not know; there were, of course, many people who might not see quite eye to eye with the Government in this Bill.

This Bill had been brought forward under certain circumstances and it had been debated under somewhat peculiar circumstances, and many people thought that this great subject had not received the full attention it should have received. It seemed to him that if this Amendment, which was now under discussion, became law and they prescribed a term of years they would get into the difficulty, and perhaps a larger one than might be at the present moment recognised, of making a certain bargain with the licensees and the owners of public-houses, and that if they once created a term of years they would have a great many considerations, so to speak, built upon it. They would have certain contracts that would be formed upon the basis of a fourteen years certainty as to the question of compensation. They would have also many agreements depending upon that. They would besides have what had not been much touched upon at present, but was a most serious consideration in this Bill, viz., how they were to value the different licensed terms with regard to compensation, and if they once admitted a term of years he thought they would have bases of valuation founded upon it. They would also have bases of insurance in many different forms upon this term of years, all of which when the time came might be somewhat difficult to upset, whether it was a good thing or a bad thing to upset them.

It was quite possible that as years and probably not very many years went on, public opinion, which had shown a great interest in this question, might become stronger and stronger perhaps in view of a thoroughly well thought-out temperance movement, excluding fanatical consideration, because he believed fanaticism, unless inspired by genius, would generally defeat its own object. But there might be a strong public opinion to influence the Government of the day in such a way that they could not well afford to disregard it. It might be the wish of the country that the licensing authorities should have a much freer hand in dealing with these licences, and that the question of compensation, although it might be admitted to be a fair principle, ought not to stand in the way of reducing the number of licensed premises which so many people at present were agreed should be the case. He would assume for a moment that these things had a very marked effect in the course of five or six years, and that legislation was forced upon the Parliament and Government of the time; what were they then to do with those existing fourteen, and, perhaps, if the Amendment were fully carried out, twenty-one years? Fourteen years was a long period in the life of an individual; it was a still longer period in the history of any nation or any Parliament, and what he would suggest to their Lordships was, that it would be perhaps somewhat unwise to fetter the present legislation with a condition, which, although the present intention was good, would hamper and fetter the action of Parliament and the Government in the future.

He could not help thinking this was, perhaps, the strongest argument for not passing the Amendment which had been moved with regard to this time limit. In many cases, particularly in this case, when a new departure of considerable magnitude in the licensing question was being adopted, it was extremely difficult to tell exactly what might issue from it. The promoters of this Bill thought that one thing would result from it; the opponents thought that another thing would result. One side thought it would effect great salutary reforms, and the other that it would be productive of great evils. A late statesman, among his many clever sayings, used to say that nothing happened except the unforeseen, and it was quite possible that the opinions of the Government on the one hand, and of the opponents on the other, might both be right. The strong probability was that they would both be wrong, and that an entirely different effect from what was expected now might turn out to be the result of this Bill. That appeared to him rather to intensify the argument that it would be somewhat unwise to put out our hands further than it was possible to draw them back. Let them not create a difficulty in the way of reviewing any possible abuse that might arise from this legislation, or, on the other hand, of improving and carrying out any good effect that it had done. They had better follow out the old proverb to let well—or if some of their Lordships preferred it—to let ill alone.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said no doubt there was a great deal to be said for this Amendment, in the sense that it would operate as a sort of promise to give a reasonable time to turn round for reasonable interests, whether they were called vested or not, and at the end of the term, a great deal too long time, it would tend to restore to the people of England full control, free from any moral as well as any legal criticism. The terms were undoubtedly extremely liberal, and he could not help feeling that if they had been accepted by His Majesty's Government they would have made a very good bargain for — he would not venture to say their clients—but at any rate for those persons who in the general opinion of the community were largely interested financially in the passing of this Bill, because if by general agreement this Amendment of the most rev. Primate had been accepted, and if it had been accepted in the House of Commons, no doubt there would have been a very strong claim of fairness that this was to be a *modus vivendi* for the next fourteen years, during which it would be very unfair to reopen great questions in regard to licence duties. He could not help feeling himself that, having regard to the way in which this Bill had been carried so far, those who dissented from it had a perfectly free hand to deal with it in a most stringent way if ever the majority should be on their side, and he might remind their Lordships that this question of high duties—not so high necessarily as in the United States of America, but very much higher than anything that had been contemplated in this country—was quite within the scope of any Government, and if he were interested in the trade of the licensed victuallers, which he was thankful to say he was not, he was not sure that he would not feel inclined rather to get a settlement upon some reasonable terms which would secure him a considerable period of years than trust to the accidents of the political future.

He would now turn to the speech of the noble Marquess, who had made the principal speech on behalf of the Government against this Amendment. He would not follow him into the regions of morals and spoliation. He thought that had been adequately dealt with, but he should like their Lordships to consider one or two cases which came very vividly to their recollection where the House had absolutely disregarded claims very much stronger in point of law and equity than any claims where people, either through brewery companies or otherwise, had bought at enormous prices. When the Irish Land Act was being passed, a strong case was made for those who had bought estates in the Encumbered Estates Courts, with a Parliamentary guarantee of title in every way, but nevertheless they, and of course their Lordships' House, was party to that Act, much as they disliked it, passed it, although, no doubt, it would have been in their power had they chosen to make exceptional legislation, perhaps at the expense of the Treasury and national credit, which had guaranteed those titles. He might remind their Lordships of another case, with regard to the importation of foreign cattle, in which the very keen desire to protect the health of our herds was not always entirely dissociated from the desire to enhance the price of our herds. Parliament first of all passed laws requiring slaughter of cattle at the port of entry and various urban authorities—London, Liverpool, and other places—went to a very great expense under Parliamentary sanction and with money borrowed with the sanction of the Public Works Loan Commissioners to erect abattoirs at the port of entry. In a very few years the sense of what was due to our home cattle and their health became so intense that they thought they could not even allow animals to come from foreign countries, even although they might be slaughtered within that quarantined and limited area. The whole of these important yards had to be turned over to the scrap heap. The question was put very strongly that these urban authorities had invested very large sums of money in obedience to Parliamentary obligations but their claims were utterly disregarded. Of course all of their Lordships in going through the history of legislation and the interests injured could find many other industries where legislation had given no thought to the claims or interests of private people. As recently as the other day in another place a very strong claim was put forward in connection with strips of tobacco, and although it was conclusively proved that the unhappy importers had lost very considerably they only got back from the Government about one half of the proved losses they had sustained. Therefore he thought that this exaggerated sentiment of conscientious devotion to the interests of brewers and others who had speculated in public-houses and shares was a little misplaced in dealing with this question of legislation.

He would like to touch upon another point in the noble Marquess's speech. The noble Marquess seemed to be very much perplexed as to how it would be possible to adjust with any fairness a scale of compensation which would operate in the way proposed by the Amendment. He, the speaker, should have thought that if this clause of the most rev. Primate, or any similar clause were passed, it would be a very elementary calculation for any man in business to see that year by year the value of a licence was a diminishing quantity. The value of the licence would be for a term running for twenty-one years, and in the first year the person whose licences were suppressed would lose an interest amounting to about twenty-one years. In the second year it would go down by one year, and so on, and therefore there would be no abrupt break such as the noble Marquess suggested would baffle the ingenuity of calculators. Perhaps it was not much good stating these things although they might recommend themselves to the reason of those accustomed to arithmetic or affairs, yet not to the votes of those who, he was afraid, were determined to support the Government.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Oh!

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said he was very glad to hear that "Oh!" because that implied that when they went into the division lobby they would be better supported than they were before. He should wait with curious expectancy to see whether that would be so.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I only made an interjection because I thought it very hard that all the noble Lords who sit on this side of the House should be considered incapable of arithmetic or affairs.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said he only commented on the arithmetic presented by the noble Marquess.

VISCOUNT CROSS said he had listened with the greatest attention to what fell from the most rev. Primate, but he thought in that speech there were three fallacies. In the first place, he thought their Lordships agreed with him the other night that it was wrong to take away these licences without some compensation at the present moment. That was agreed on all hands. What he had to say the other night was this: that if it were wrong to take them away now it would be just as wrong to take them away at the end of seven years, as was suggested by the Minority Report, and, if at the end of seven years, then it would be just as wrong in principle to take them away at the end of fourteen years. The most rev. Primate had said they were going to give twenty-one years, and that was quite long enough. He maintained that if it were wrong to take them away to-morrow without compensation it would be equally wrong as a matter of principle to take them away that day twenty-one years. As a matter of detail whether the wrong would be so much or not he would not say, but as a matter of principle it was absolutely just as wrong to take away something which was his—he did not care what they called it, expectation or whatever it was—at the end of twenty-one years as to take it away to-morrow. But then the most rev. Primate said there would be no hardship or grievance because in the meantime the licensee would be able to reap a golden harvest, and people would go on drinking although they reduced the number of houses. He was afraid the reduction would not be so great, and therefore if the number of houses were reduced, those houses that remained would only get the profit which those houses which had been done away with would otherwise receive. That was his second fallacy.

What was the whole basis of legislation of this kind? It was, he thought, with common consent, that the increase in the number of drinking-shops, because they were drinking-shops, offered a temptation to men going to or from their work which they were not able to resist, and that therefore the increase in the sale of alcoholic liquors and the increase of drunkenness was a natural consequence. He thought the whole object of this legislation, and he was quite sure the whole of the right rev. Bench would agree with him, was to take away the temptation, so that a man should not be tempted to do that which he would not do if there were not a public-house open for him to go to, and that the reduction of drunkenness would be very largely in proportion to the number of licences taken away. "But," says the most rev. Primate, "I have spoken to several gentleman who are largely interested in this trade and they agree with me, and would be very glad to see this Amendment passed." He had not the smallest doubt they would. Why? They were perfectly aware of the conduct of the magistrates up to the present moment, and the magistrates had said, "Although it is very wise that we should diminish the number of public-houses we will not do it unless we can give them some compensation. We think it would be a wrong and injury to them to take away something that they have got, something which the nation has agreed they should have, unless you are going to give them compensation." What would happen? At the end of seven, fourteen, or twenty-five years, he did not care what number of years they fixed as their time limit, the action of the magistrates would remain. The law would be the same. The justices would say at the end of seven years or fourteen years what they did now; they would not permit the injustice of taking away a man's licence unless they could give some compensation. The action of the magistrates would be the same seven, fourteen, or even twenty-one years hence, and he did not wonder at the brewers, who were perfectly able to take care of themselves and who could see through the whole of this matter, saying to the most rev. Primate, "We shall be quite content with your plan, because we know perfectly well that at the end of any term of years the action of the magistrates will be as it is to-day, and we shall get through your

Amendment a permanent interest in the annual licence." For those reasons he strongly objected to the Amendment of the most rev. Primate.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I cannot help welcoming the speech of the noble Viscount as containing in its fulness a principle which we have always expected to lurk within the Bill. The most rev. Primate began his speech by endeavouring to establish the proposition that this Bill sets up something like a freehold where only an annual legal licence is conferred, but the noble Viscount proved the most rev. Primate's proposition even beyond any limit that the most rev. Primate can have conceived. He said that in seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years the claim for compensation would be exactly the same as it is now. I ask you, my Lords, in passing, to consider if there can be a more convincing proof of the contention of the most rev. Primate than the speech of the noble Viscount. What is it, after all, that the most rev. Primate wishes to enact? He wishes by a liberal provision of years to provide for the extinction of that interest which is not legal according to the admission even of the noble and learned Lord upon the Woolsack, but which is equitable according to the more charitable views of those who are interested, I will not say in the trade, but in the ordinary traditions of fair dealing as against a trade which it has been proved has been recognised far beyond the limits that the law contemplated. The most rev. Primate desires by a long period of years to extinguish those interests. I must confess I think his proposal unduly liberal to the interests which it is proposed to extinguish. But I do not suppose the most rev. Primate in his wildest dreams could have expected such support as he has received from the noble Viscount who has just sat down. The noble Viscount maintained that at the end of twenty-one years the interest of the licence-holder will be as great as it is at the present moment, that the magistrates at the end of twenty-one years will say, "We cannot extinguish this licence because it would be doing an injury to a man who has held it for all these years." There could be no greater proof of the proposition of the most rev. Prelate.

Now, my Lords, what is twenty-one years? It is the life of a young man. In Scotland we have a system of leases which is supposed to extinguish the interests of the tenant in nineteen years. But what is the interest of the farming tenant in Scotland? It is an interest given by the landlord from an estate possessed by the landlord and taken over by the tenant on that understanding. What is the interest of the tenant in the licensed public-house? Why, we have had proclaimed from the Woolsack, in oracular tones, what I am bound to say we knew already, that the interest of the tenant is for one year and for one year only. I do not wish to push that argument too far; but contrast the position of the licence-holder with a licence of that description, which is not a bit better than the game licence which most of your Lordships take out, with the interest of the Scotch farming tenant which is supposed to be exhausted in nineteen years.

I have not taken part in the debates on this measure because I am well aware that many of your Lordships have wished to speak, and when many of your Lordships wish to speak I wish to remain silent, because I wish to give place to a better man. I quite admit the objections in detail to the proposition of the most rev. Primate. I see there are objections of partial injustice. There will always be objections of partial injustice in great propositions of reform in important classes of the community. My belief is simply this: that the ideal temperance reform is not by compensation. If I had the opportunity of introducing a Bill, I would not introduce compensation at all by money. I would have compensation entirely by the expiration of time. I do not care what your limit is; I am sure it would be much larger than either justice or equity demanded, but I am certain of this, that the only way in which you will ever achieve a real temperance reform in this country is by fixing a date, at the expiration of which all interest in the licence will be held to be exhausted, and the nation then will resume its claim, its absolute dominion, over the interests which have been so created at the expense of the State and of no other than the State.

My noble friend Lord Spencer, in his speech on the Second Reading, quoted figures which show the enormous value of the interests embarked in liquor —interests admittedly constituted, or largely constituted, since the important decision in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" when there could be no excuse for anyone interested in that trade saying he was not aware of the law and the interests which he possessed under the strict letter of the law. I agree with all that my noble friend said, but he did not draw the particular deduction—at least, not in my hearing—which I should have made from those figures. My deduction from those figures is, of course, in the first instance that which was made by my noble friend, that this capital has been largely invested since the authoritative declaration of the law which no one could mistake; but the second deduction, to my mind, is infinitely more important than that, which is that these interests represent a capital —I will not say which should belong to the State, but which is the free gift of the State, or almost the free gift of the State, and which therefore is a heritage which the State is alienating. Until the State has resumed the control of that great boon which it has given to a particular interest there can be no real reform in regard to the liquor question, and the State itself—that is a minor view in comparison with public morality and public safety—cannot resume the revenues which it should draw from this interest, and which, as the Bishop of London clearly proved in his eloquent speech—one of the few speeches which I have heard in this House which was too short—are drawn by communities like New York from that interest. Well, my Lords, I say that you cannot deny that the State by giving a licence or the public by giving a licence, whichever you choose to call it, gives an enormous profit very often to the person who holds that licence. There are instances of men who have been offered £18,000 for a licence before they left the hall in which that licence was granted. To whom does that £18,000 belong? According to the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, so far as I have been able to hear his argument, we are bound to compensate every extravagant price that has been given for a tied house because that price, forsooth, has been given while the Legislature did not interfere to prevent an extravagant price being given by private contract for a tied house. We are bound, if I followed the instance given by the noble Marquess, to compensate every brewery shareholder who has made an unprofitable investment in a brewery company, because he said that there were brewery companies which had realised very poor dividends and which had an equitable claim, as I understand him, to compensation. What is this vast spectacle of compensation which the Government holds out to us—the Government which is so anxious, as he says, for temperance reform—the compensation to every human being who has made a foolish bargain, provided only that that foolish bargain be connected with liquor?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Not because he has made a foolish bargain, but because he has done it under a Parliamentary title.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: What is the Parliamentary title?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl knows quite well that one-third of the licences are held under Parliamentary title, and that the remainder are held subject to the sanction of Parliament at that price because Parliament has taxed the holders at that price, and in all cases of expropriation for any public improvement they are paid for at that price.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I do not deny that the prices paid by the Government for expropriation are extravagant. I do not deny that one-third of the ante-1869 beerhouses are held under a tenure which I lament, but I am not disposed to say that because Parliament does not interfere with the annual tenure of the other two-thirds of the public-houses of this country that that constitutes a Parliamentary title, and that we are bound to compensate the extravagant prices which are paid under a misapprehension for houses held under that title. I do not wish to go into polemics on this question. The noble Marquess is not so versed in interruptions as he thinks. I have watched his very frequent interruptions, and if he cannot interrupt to better purpose than on the present occasion, I think he had better reserve himself for a speech in reply. All I venture to urge is, that the Motion of the most rev. Primate contains terms which are most generous to the trade, that those who really wish for temperance and for the national control over this particular business, which is conferred and given by the nation without any just contribution in return, are bound to vote for the Amendment of the most rev. Primate. I, myself, do not think it errs on the side of generosity. I, myself, should prefer an Amendment which by simply giving a time limit to all licences without interference, except for misconduct, would give a valuable property which would be exhausted in fourteen years, or less possibly, but certainly in fourteen years, and which would bring this system to an end. There would be, I admit, no formal reduction of licences, but there would be practically a reduction of licences because the non-paying licences, many of which are only kept going in the hope of compensation, and in the hope of being bought up by some of these brewery companies, would extinguish themselves, knowing as they would that their doom was coming within a limited time. I say, then, that I would welcome the most rev. Primate's Amendment as an important step in licensing reform, but speaking individually I cannot believe it to be conclusive—I do not believe it to be the best form of reform. I think that by that which I have sketched out, which would be intelligible, simple, and which would extinguish licences much more than is generally supposed, you would arrive at a better result than even the most rev. Primate will achieve, and certainly better than the Bill of the Government can hope to promote.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I think we all regretted we did not have the advantage of an expression of the views of the noble Earl who has just sat down upon the Second Reading of this Bill. I am very glad, indeed, that the noble Earl has repaired that omission to-night, not only by giving us his views on the Amendment of the most rev. Primate, but by telling us what, if he had been in the place of His Majesty's Government, would have been the sort of temperance legislation he would have asked the country to accept. The noble Earl would have given a time limit and nothing else. I do not think he specifically stated the number of years to which the time limit should extend. Possibly he might take the number of years that the most rev. Primate looks forward to, namely, twenty-one years. I do not know what the exact amount might be, but this I do know, that the policy is not a new policy, but is one which was introduced by a member of the noble Earl's Party, the late Lord Aberdare, and I say that the result of that policy would be for that period, be it long or be it short, to keep in existence every one of those houses which are considered undesirable, and which can be done away with under the provisions of the Bill before the House. I say that the policy would stereotype for the whole of that period the existence of those houses. The noble Earl said the non-paying houses would be got rid of, but the noble Earl seemed to think those houses are not disappearing now. They are, however, disappearing every year, and I do not believe for a moment the passing of this Bill will make any difference in the continuance of these houses. They will be the very first houses that the magistrates will recommend quarter sessions to abolish because they will not be worth anything. They will say, "Here is a house doing no business whatever. It will cost you nothing to buy it out, therefore let it be the very first to try an experiment on," and these houses will disappear in a wholesale manner throughout the country. The noble Earl made a great point of the monopoly which the State has alienated. I deplore quite as much as the noble Earl that that monopoly has been alienated by the State, but it has been done. Large sums of money have changed hands on the part of very innocent persons and not only on the part of those who have made large sums of money out of the liquor traffic. Large sums have passed owing to the State having alienated that monopoly, and I ask, are your Lordships going to say the State is to resume possession of that monopoly without giving compensation to those who have so invested their money? I think we are rather confusing two subjects in the way we are dealing with the Amendment of the most rev. Primate. There is first the expectancy of the renewal of licences, and, secondly, the resumption by the State of the monopoly value which it has alienated. The Bill of the Government does not pretend to deal with the question of the resumption of the monopoly value. The Amendment does. But what the Government proposes is to deal with the question of the expectancy of renewal which is entertained by every licence-holder in the country. It may not be a well-founded expectation, but at any rate it has existed for a very large number of years, and the Government propose to take away that expectancy of renewal from the licence-holder by the process of making him insure against its loss.

I heard the noble Marquess opposite, I think, say that there was ample reserve funds in the hands of the trade to provide for insurance after the fourteen years, and during the ensuing seven years in which they are to be secured by the most rev. Primate. Well, my Lords, but what are the burdens in connection with the extinction of licences which are being put upon this trade? In the first place, they were told in 1890 by Mr. Goschen that an additional tax must be placed upon whiskey in order that licences might be expropriated. That tax was duly put on, but no licences were expropriated and the trade up to this moment has continued to pay that tax, although no licences have been expropriated. Then they are told to, and I believe they do, insure against the risk, which is not altered by the Bill, of forfeiture owing to misconduct. Then, thirdly, they are to make the provision required by the Bill, and now the most rev. Primate says in addition to that they must set by during the short period of seven years a sum sufficient to compensate them for that which the State will take away without any compensation at the end of the third seven years. After fourteen years they will have to set apart another sinking fund which is to provide for the extinction of their monopoly value. But the most rev. Primate says: Yes, but what a golden harvest they will make during these seven years! I ask, is it in the interest of the State that they should make this golden harvest? It will mean that for seven years they cannot lose their licences even on compensation. It will mean that they must push their opportunity to the utmost they possibly can in order that they may recoup the amount of money they are to lose under the proposals of the most rev. Primate. All I can say is that, in my opinion, every part of the value of the licence-holder's property—and I am not afraid to use the word property—that was not fully compensated for during those seven years would be so much property confiscated. Why do we want this time limit? Under the Bill the extinction of licences will go on continuously, and I believe by the time fourteen years have expired, and perhaps earlier, there will not be more licences in existence—and they will be carried on in well conducted, convenient houses—than are required for the interest of the population of this country; but if there be, the compensation fund will continue, the remaining houses as they become more valuable will have to pay more towards that fund and so house after house, wherever one is not required, can be extinguished under the Bill.

My Lords, after all this is a new departure. It is an experiment. The noble Marquess opposite said he did not wish to have his hands tied. My Lords, His Majesty's Government do not wish to tie the hands of this country. Why should we look ahead for twenty-one years? There is nothing in the world at the end of seven or fourteen years to prevent the most rev. Primate coming forward and making the proposal he makes to-night, and we shall have the advantage at the end of that time of all the experience of the extent to which licences will have been extinguished by this Bill. So your Lordships will be better advised, instead of tying your hands for twenty-one years from this year 1904, to allow the Bill to pass in the condition in which it now is, and to give an opportunity to Parliament, and possibly to noble Lords opposite or their friends at the end of fourteen years, of bringing in another measure, even for confiscation, if they can persuade the people of this country to accept such a measure.

VISCOUNT PEEL said he had come down to the House in the fullest hope that even at this eleventh hour on the debate on that great question it might have been possible for a compromise to be arrived at—a reasonable settlement which would appeal not to heated partisan feeling, but to the general sense of fairness and justice of the country. The most rev. Primate came forward with a suggestion, which he himself, holding the views that he did, found very difficult to accept. He said for the sake of peace and for the sake of looking forward to a period when we would get rid of compensation by the State and of this monopoly enjoyed by individuals, let us have a period of fourteen years during which there will be a halycon period of security. But that was not all. After that halcyon period had expired there was to be a seven years supplementary period of lease during which the whole profits of their trade, which he thought would be very considerable, would go into the pockets of the licence-holders. That seemed to be a very large concession to make. The Amendment, he understood, even proposed to bring within its scope the ante-1869 beerhouses, thus giving them a most liberal system of compensation. He hoped he should not seem extreme when he said that he regarded these beerhouses as absolutely unentitled to any consideration of compensation whatsoever. It was by a mere chance that they ever got into the privileged position they occupied, and more than that, in the year 1882 when it was the brewers' interest to get rid of competition, they joined with other parties in sweeping out of existence without an atom of compensation, a great number of off-licences, which had just as much right, if any right existed, as the on-licences had. Was the consideration of the House to be extended to these 1882 beerhouses which were swept away? But extreme as he thought the concession of the most rev. Primate to be, he for one was ready to accept it because he regarded it as a way out of the difficulty. He had never presumed to think that the Government would not accept such a compromise, which they could easily have made acceptable in the other House if they chose, and which they were told that night on high authortiy had been accepted by some of the best, the most respectable, and the leading members of the trade itself. If their Lordships, by the division that night, rejected this most liberal and extreme compromise which had been offered to the trade, he very much doubted whether they would be able to persuade the country ever to make such a liberal offer again. He regretted it.

He was proud to hear the noble Earl Lord Rosebery say that he was against any money compensation. He was very proud to hear that, because that had always been his own view from the first, and he had expressed it in his Report. He held that there should be a time notice issued to the trade, and that for an unexpired period of that notice commutation should be allowed, because the licences would be taken away from the trade at an earlier period. Those left for the period of years would have the full enjoyment of the period, and they would have exhausted any right they had. A seven years period, he admitted, might be too short. Let them make it fourteen, but do let them at the end of it see some chance of getting rid of this present state of things in regard to which the Government themselves had held out a hope and a promise that it might come to an end by their system of the seven years licence, which they themselves had advocated. Whether the period was seven years or ten or even fourteen, they would at the end of it see some chance of getting rid of the present state of things. If they could only get some hope of an end of the present state of things he would accept almost anything, but if these terms were not accepted then, speaking for himself, he should feel at liberty to adhere to his own plan of a notice of seven years for England and five years for Scotland. But let them make it more than that if they liked rather than go on perpetuating this trade, perpetuating the vested interest, tying up the hands of posterity for all time, and continuing a state of things which, in its present condition, was absolutely intolerable to the country at large.

*The LORD BISHOP of RIPON said he ventured for a few moments to intervene and to express what appeared to him a just and reasonable view of the present proposal before their Lordships. He had been one of those who had never been able to share the strong and, perhaps he might be forgiven if he said the fanatical, opposition to every conceivable idea of compensation. In his judgment, it might be perfectly true in law that the members of this trade were not entitled to any compensation, but on the other hand, it did seem to him that it would be a very ungenerous and unworthy attitude on the part of any of those entrusted with the legislation of the country to take up the position that, when they had allowed certain interests to grow up they would stand on legal rights and not on equitable considerations.

But he had another reason, which he ventured with all humility to put before their Lordships and to ask them to consider. There was no moment of a man' life in which he ought to act with greater consideration for others than the moment when he was assured that he had embarked on an enterprise for good, because (and this is almost always the dark shadow which waits on the enthusiasms of men) they are tempted, in their earnestness to abolish a great abuse, to forget the just steps by which alone that abuse can be vitally remedied. The history of the past was instinct with examples to remind them that the policy of achieving good at the expense of a little evil had almost always reacted on the progress of good. While he found himself, as he believed the majority of the Members on both sides of that House found themselves, earnestly desirous to put an end to a state of things which contributed to the misery, poverty, and degeneration of this country, then, because conscious of a real enthusiasm to do something to put an end to that state of things, he was the more apprehensive and the more anxious to ask himself whether the method which seemed to be right would transgress by one iota the interest of others.

He could not see one iota of injustice in the method which had been proposed by the most rev. Primate. It was in the nature of a twenty-one years notice given to the trade. Did it do any injustice collectively to the trade? He thought not. The whole trade collectively would have the advantage of trading for twenty-one years with this advantage given into their hands that the last seven years, were to be seven years of uninterrupted progress. They would be the seven not lean, but fat years of their licences. If the value of the licence was diminished as a saleable commodity as the twenty-one years came to a close, was the value of the trade diminished during those twenty-one years? Was it not the fact that those who were the survivors would be in a position in which they were making considerably more profit than would otherwise be the case? and therefore it seemed to him that collectively the position of the trade would be one in which there was not one iota of injustice. Was the Amendment unjust to the individual? It was urged that it was the survivor who would be the unfortunate person, but, in his opinion, the wise and far-seeing business man would elect to take advantage of the seven fat years rather than accept compensation at the end of fourteen years. If he thought for one instant that by carrying this measure they would inflict an injustice on the individual, he would rather postpone it for ten years. But he did not believe that. He had been strongly apprehensive of the danger of a time limit until he had been shown there was to be no interference, because the prolongation of opportunity was an abundant opportunity for the man who did not receive compensation at an earlier period. For that reason he hoped some *modus vivendi* might be found by which the principle of this Amendment would be accepted and passed by their Lordships.

THE EARL OF LYTTON said that on the Second Reading of the Bill he had ventured to say that while he saw many elements of good in the Bill and many elements which he considered a step in the direction of temperance reform, at the same time there were shortcomings, which he would have liked to see filled up, and it was because he thought to a large measure this Amendment did supply these deficiencies that he was inclined to vote for it on the division. It seemed to him that the difference between the Government and those who were in favour of this Amendment was that they were satisfied with a general reduction of licences, rapid perhaps or slow, while those in favour of the Amendment were anxious to get rid of the present system altogether. The chief argument against the Amendment had been the one put forward by the noble Viscount, Lord Cross, who said that if it was unfair and unjust to take away a licence without giving compensation to-day, it was equally unjust to take away a licence without giving compensation to-morrow or seven or fourteen years hence. With that he entirely agreed, but were they in the Amendment going to take away the licence without giving compensation?

There were two ways in which compensation could be given, either in money as under this Bill, or in time as had been suggested by the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery. He undoubtedly agreed with him in preferring that principle to the principle laid down in the Bill, but at the same time this Amendment seemed to be a mixture of the two systems, and in his opinion it lacked the faults of both of them, because, as had been so well pointed out by Lord Onslow, the main objection to a system of compensation by time was that during that period you could not refuse licences. While that period is going on you stereotype and fix all existing licences, but it seemed to him that with the Amendment of the most rev. Primate the licences would be refused with compensation under the principle of the Bill, and then at the end of the time, seven years would be given in which licences would survive, and at the end of that time all existing licences would lapse. What, then, would be the position of the noble Marquess who spoke against the Amendment on behalf of the Government? What would be the position of the man who survived, and who would have held his licence for fourteen years and have paid his insurance? He would then have his licence fixed for seven years, and as had been pointed out by several speakers the value of his licensed house would be very much greater than it was to-day, and with all deference to Lord Cross, who said that if you reduce licences you will also reduce the drink, he thought it would be admitted that the proportion between the reduction of licences and of drink was not so great as to prevent the value of the remaining licences going up considerably. In the case of the man who held his licence for twenty-one years, in all probability his licence would be renewed on a new system which would reserve the monopoly value to the State. It was true the business of that man after the twenty-one years would not be so valuable as it was to-day, but was it not because they held his business was too precious to him and too costly to the State that they wished to see this Amendment carried out? His licence would be renewed to him, but on different terms.

He seemed to see two drawbacks to this Amendment. One was that it was useless to put an end to the existing system unless they had something to put in its place, and it seemed to him that the system in Clause 4 was not sufficiently defined to give a satisfactory alternative to the present system. Therefore he confessed that he would like to see the whole question treated in another Bill, where a very definite system would be introduced to take the place of the present one at the end of fourteen years; but not only that, he felt there was no very definite provision in the Amendment of the most rev. Primate for securing that the licences should all terminate at the end of twenty-one years. They might or they might not. He would, on the whole, prefer to see the whole question settled in another Bill which would bring all licences under the present system to an end in a definite period and establish another system in its place.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I suppose the debate on this important question is not likely to last very much longer, and I shall not prolong it to any extent, but I should like, as I feel very strongly on the subject, to address to your Lordships a few words on what has passed during the discussion of the Amendment of the most rev. Primate. My Lords, I confess I am deeply disappointed at the result of the debate. I am not disappointed at the arguments which have been used by the most rev. Primate and others, because I think they have been couched in the most moderate terms, in the most clear terms, and in the most able terms. But I confess I am disappointed at the speeches we have heard from the Front Bench opposite. My Lords, I have the greatest respect for the noble Marquess and I should conceive that he was a most moderate man in his opinions and ready to consider a broad view of any question, and not the immediate view, but the view which would have effect in the future. Well, my Lords, I am afraid I have been disappointed with his speech. The noble

Marquess has really spoken as almost the absolute advocate of what I called in my speech the school of complete property. He has entirely neglected what I conceive to be a very prominent condition in this matter, and that is the legal position in which all these licence-holders are. They hold this monopoly of enormous value from the State on a basis which is not that of complete property. We have had it over and over again from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack and others that this licence which is given to them by the State is only held for one year. But, as I said the other day, property of enormous value has been put into the hands of the brewing interest. Well, my Lords, they must have known that this property was not an absolute property; they must have known that it was a property held under certain conditions.

There are other points of the noble Marquess's speech which I feel rather strongly about. There is a question of what would happen at the end of this period which the most rev. Primate gives us. I do not see that at the end of the period the question of giving power to the magistrates is to be considered unless there is an absolute right to some compensation—I mean a right to some money value for their position. There would be many people, quite fair and unprejudiced persons, who might be on the bench. The noble Marquess the other day, to whom I am quite sure I should be quite ready to trust any interest I have judicially, I think pointed to the noble Viscount, Lord Peel, and said, that if there had been a bench over which the noble Viscount was presiding, do you think that people would like to appeal to him? There is a class of people in this country who never believe that anybody can take action or give a decision independent of private motive. I always rebel against that. When I find the noble Marquess saying that the noble Viscount could not be trusted in a matter of this sort I am surprised, and I protest against it, because I think it is a very unjust view to take, and because I am sure of the high impartiality of the noble Viscount. Whatever he has said on the subject, were he sitting judicially on this question I am sure everybody could have complete confidence in him.

In regard to other matters the noble Marquess said that the proposal of the most rev. Primate amounted to pillage. I am surprised at such a doctrine as that, and if such violent views as that are taken, and when I see an absence of fair feeling and moderation on the subject, I feel in despair of appealing to your Lordships' House to bring this question to a satisfactory conclusion. I feel the greatest possible interest in this question. I know what enormous feeling there is in the country about it. I believe that the view we and the most rev. Primate take is perfectly fair and just towards the brewers and the brewing interest, and yet this proposition is scouted by the noble Marquess and the Government and no consideration whatever given to it. I am in despair when I consider such a view has been taken on this great subject. I lament it extremely, and I look with immense horror, if I may use such a word, as to what is likely to happen in the future in connection with this subject. I do not know if the noble Marquess and the Government understand what a deep feeling there is on this subject of licensing and temperance reform in the country. There is the deepest desire to take some broad step to minimise this evil. The noble Marquess himself thinks that also, but taking this Bill, which gives an enormous gift in perpetuity to the brewing interest, I maintain that it will not do anything to settle this great question. It will only add to the difficulties in the future, and in the future we shall have a greater agitation on this subject and greater difficulty than ever. I quite admit, and I bow to the noble Earl, Lord Onslow, that we shall have to deal with it. He gives us a long life and he tells us that fourteen years hence we may be dealing with it. It is very kind of him to give us such a long life, and it is quite possible some of us on this side may be alive then and in office then, though I do not think I shall be. I express my deep regret at the tone and turn given to this debate, and I deplore that the Government cannot hold out some hope of a compromise on this great subject, which would bring it to an end.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I believe

I am expressing my own feelings and those of my friends when I say that nothing would have given us greater satisfaction than to have found it consistent with our convictions to go into the same lobby with the most rev. Primate. In the first place it would be agreeable to us to act with one who throughout these discussions has approached the subject in such an admirable spirit of fairness and moderation, and, if I may be allowed to add, speaking for myself, I would say this, that I should have been glad to join with him in an attempt to resume for the public that great heritage of which he spoke and to support, if it were possible to do so, some reasonable scheme for extinguishing the monopoly value of these licences. I regard it as an unhealthy excrescence for the existence of which we are ourselves responsible, and if the most rev. Primate had been able to show us some way of getting rid of the monopoly value by a scheme fair to the persons concerned in this trade, and also not unduly onerous to those out of whose pockets the necessary compensation would have been derived, I should have been the first to recognise the value of the most rev. Primate's service. But I am constrained to say that I do not believe the proposal he has laid before your Lordships' House can be described in any such language.

The noble Earl on the Cross Benches, Lord Rosebery, supported the most rev. Primate's Amendment, but he laid before your Lordships a plan of his own and it was not by any means the plan of the most rev. Primate. It was a plan different from the proposals of the most rev. Primate on the one hand and I need not say different from the Bill of His Majesty's Government. My noble friend Lord Lytton put the case very clearly when he said that you can provide the necessary compensation for getting rid of the monopoly value either in time or in money. The noble Earl's proposal was that compensation should be offered in time, but, my Lords, is it not clear that if compensation in that shape is to be given it carries with it as an essential idea the idea of immunity whilst the time limit is running? The Government Bill, on the contrary, is based on an idea essentially of a different description. The essential principle in our Bill is that we should obtain out of the pockets of the trade itself the means of putting an end to those licences which can be shown to be redundant, and it seems to me absolutely impossible to graft the scheme of the noble Earl on the Cross Benches on the scheme of the Government Bill.

Well, my Lords, one word as to the proposal of the most rev. Primate. He has explained to the House that it is his great desire to afford to those who will be dispossessed of their licences an equitable and adequate measure of compensation. Now, my Lords, what is the measure of compensation which the most rev. Primate offers? He proposes that there shall be a total time limit of twenty-one years, and the noble Earl on the Cross Benches dwelt on the length of that period, comparing it with the nineteen years for which a Scotch agricultural lease runs. My Lords, analogies are always rather dangerous things, and I am not sure that agricultural analogies are not especially dangerous, although I used one myself the other night, But has not the noble Earl considered that the position of the Scotch tenant at the beginning of the nineteen years lease is not quite the same as the position of the present holder of a licence? I am under the impression that the Scotch tenant comes in with an absolutely clean slate. He may be an outsider. He takes the farm, and during the nineteen years he makes what he can out of it; but the licence-holder with whom we are dealing is a person who has already got the licence and who is entitled to expect that he will continue to possess it if he conducts himself properly.

The Earl of ROSEBERY: Was he born with a licence?

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: No certainly not, but he has held his licence for a period of years during which he has had a reasonable expectation of having that licence renewed.

The Earl of ROSEBERY: I think the noble Marquess forgets that there must be a beginning for a licence as there is for a lease.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: I do not think that argument will hold water. I wish to compare the position of the Scotch tenant, whom the noble Earl cited, at the beginning of his nineteen years lease and that of the licensee with whom we have to deal, and I maintain that the position of the two men is wholly different. I come back to the proposal of the most rev. Primate. His period of twenty-one years is divided into two parts. There is in the first place a period of fourteen years during which the licensee will continue to pay the insurance which can be levied from him under this Bill. During these fourteen years you are giving the licensee nothing; you are, to use a familiar expression, giving the dog a bite off his own tail, and so far as those fourteen years are concerned you cannot claim that you are compensating the persons concerned. Then comes the final period of seven years—those seven years which the most rev. Primate describes a the halcyon years. I confess I do not see in the position of the licensee in those seven years anything so particularly attractive. We tell him, so it is suggested, that he is to push his trade for all it is worth, and reap a golden harvest, and I suppose in that short period of time to accumulate savings sufficient to indemnify him against the misfortunes which impend upon him. But at the end of the seven years comes "the blind Fury with the abhorred shears," and the poor man's life becomes of the most precarious description. I cannot honestly say that either in the fourteen years or the seven years is really to be found that amount of full and equitable compensation which I understand most Members of your Lordships' House desire to be provided for those whose business prospects are to be threatened.

But, my Lords, look at it from another point of view. What does the public get under this arrangement of the most rev. Primate? Why, my Lords, the most rev. Primate and many other advocates of temperance look forward to a moment when it will be possible to deal in a much more enterprising fashion with the great question of temperance and with the question of monopoly value. But under the proposal of the most rev. Primate that moment is to be put off for no less than twenty-one years, the life of a man, as the noble Lord on the Cross Benches said. It is that proposal that is recommended to us by noble Lords who beg and implore us that we should do nothing to tie the hands of our successors. How can we tie the hands of our successors more effectually than by setting up this period of twenty-one years, during which nothing can be done? I am constrained to say that while my inclination is to admire anything that is proposed to us by the most rev. Primate, I can see in the recommendation he has made to us nothing, except what is foreign to the purpose of our Bill, unjust, to the licensees, and likely, I fear, to oppose a considerable obstacle to future measures of reform.

*EARL GREY said he had heard with the greatest possible satisfaction the unqualified expressions of opinions from the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, and the noble Marquess who had just addressed the House on the question of monopolies. The former regarded monopoly as outrageous and the latter spoke of it as an unhealthy excrescence. On the discussion of the next clause it would be easy for him to point out that under the Bill in its present form the Government were giving a new monopoly to the holders of existing licences, and as he had never attached much importance to the time limit provided the compensation to existing licences was limited to their value at the time of the passing of the Act, he would vote with the Government against the Amendment of the most rev. Primate in the belief that the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, and the noble Marquess, the Leader of the House, would be faithful in the discussions which would take place on Clause 2 to the declarations they had made against monopolies.

On Question, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 52; Not-Contents, 126.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E. [*Teller*]

Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Crewe, E.

Kimberley, E.
Lytton, E.
Northbrook, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.

Tankerville, E.
Temple, E.

Cobham, V.
Falmouth, V.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen*),
Peel, V.

Bath and Wells, L. Bp.
Chester, L. Bp.
Durham, L. Bp.
Hereford, L. Bp.
Lichfield, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.

Norwich, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.
Ripon, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. David's L. Bp.

Armstrong, L.
Balfour, L.
Biddulph, E.
Brassey, L.
Braye, L.
Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L. [*Teller*]
Davey, L.
Denman, L.

Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*)
Farrer, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Monkswell, L.
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery*)
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran*)
Welby, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E (*L. Chancellor*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry*) (*L. President*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal*)

Argyll, D.
Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Richmond and Gordon, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn*)
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Cholmondeley, M.
Exeter, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain*)
Bathursd, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cawdor, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Denbigh, E.
Derby, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*)
Drogheda, E.
Eldon, E.
Feversham, E.
Grey, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Howe, E.

Lathom, E.
Londesborough, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mayo, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Powis, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller*]
Westmeath, E.
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Halifax, V.
Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*)
Knutsford, V.

Landaff, L. Bp.

Addington, L.
Alington, L.
Allerton, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Bolton, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton*)
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.

Deramore, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow*)
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall*)
Forester, L.
Glanusk, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L.
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hylton, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore*)
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly*)
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham*)
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Newton, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Raglan, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Rosmead, L.
Rossmore, L.
Rothschild, L.
Sherborne, L.
Sinclair, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Suffield, L.
Tredegar, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss*)
Wenlock, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

Clause 2—

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said that the object of his Amendment was that there should be no doubt as to the valuation that should be put on these premises. Their Lordships had been discussing the question of valuation, and they must remember that these licence-holders paid death duties, and what was wanted was that the valuation for compensation should be on the same principle as it was assessed on in the case of the death duties. He was told that the words were covered by what was in the Bill. That was so far satisfactory, but he was very anxious that there should be no possible doubt. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 5 and 6, to leave out the words, 'value of the licensed premises,' and insert the words, 'market value of the premises as licensed premises.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

Lord BELPER: I am informed that these alterations in the words are not necessary and that the object of the noble Lord is protected by the Finance Act. Practically the meaning of value is the same as that which he has given.

Lord BURGHCLERE said this was a very important confession that was made by the noble Lord in charge of the Bill. If he understood the Amendment aright the value which would be called into existence was the value which the brewers owning the tied houses had in the supplying of beer to these houses.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I think that is quite wrong.

Lord BURGHCLERE: Perhaps the noble Lord in charge of the Bill will explain what it does mean?

The Marquess of SALISBURY: The only point, as I understand it, is to put in market value instead of value. These words mean the same thing, and there is really no reason for the Amendment.

The Earl of WEMYSS said the noble Lord had stated the object he had in view. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

***Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY** said he had put down his Amendment, which was a somewhat long one, in order to raise essentially the question of the basis of calculating the value for compensation. He believed when the Bill was introduced in the House of Commons, they were told that the value was to be the value before the passing of the Act, and before the accumulation of value through the diminution of other licences. But the words had been changed in the course of passing the Bill through the Commons. They had a pathetic appeal, coupled with an attempt to compromise two members of the Government, just before the last division from the noble Earl below the Gangway, and he seemed to think he had got by his own construction of utterances by two members of the Government that this value was to be the value, not hereafter, but at the time of the passing of the Act. He did not believe for one minute that that was the operation of the clause as drawn, but he did want very clearly to secure that the value upon which compensation should be paid should not be the enhanced value, but the value before the licences were increased in value by the operation of the Bill. He thought the proposal in the Bill to measure value by death duties was an extremely delusive and wrong basis. It had been admitted that between 80 and 90 per cent. of these licensed houses were tied houses, the property of the great brewery companies. A limited company did not die, and, therefore, their interest in the licence never came to be valued for the death duties. If the magistrates cancelled or refused to renew a licence for a house in any town or populous district belonging to one of these companies what would be the effect? The brewery company would come and say that this particular public-house should be valued for what it was worth as if the owner had died. He was told that the usual thing in a town or populous district was for these brewery trusts or companies to get nearly all the public-houses in the place, and in one town they would find only two or three powerful companies. It was quite clear that, if in a town like Carlisle or Wigan, or any of those populous towns, they were to suppress two of these licences, the trust would be none the worse off, because the benefit to the remaining houses would go to the trust. But they would be compensating the brewery company on the basis that the licence had been sold in the open market. But it would never be valued because there would be no death at which the value could be calculated.

Let them consider the case of a good sized village where there were two public-houses. Did anyone doubt that if one was closed the other one would get practically the great bulk of the business of the village? Therefore, they wanted a system of valuation which would record the value at the time of the passing of this Act, and before any additional profit could accrue. He believed that in London, to some extent, the rateable value of licensed houses had been brought into some reasonable relation to their real value, but he was told that in the great mass of the country that had been very much evaded and that the public-houses were, in fact, rated at nothing like what they ought to be in relation to what the yearly tenant would pay. They were told that the arrangements for tied houses were very various. Sometimes they would be let at a high rent. More often the rent was not high, but the profit was made by compelling the publican, who might be a three months man, or a man who gave a blank transfer to the company, a mere man of straw, to buy all sorts of things at a very exorbitant price. One of the objects, he had no doubt, was to defraud the ratepayers by having the house appearing at a fictitious and low rate. In many cases the brewing companies and others had taken care to have the rateable value very much lower than the real value, and he had thought it would not be quite fair to take advantage of their dishonesty and permanently fix the compensation at the value they had put in as their yearly value, and the latter part of the Amendment was to open the door if they challenged the rateable value to enable them to come forward and say what the real value was. The Court of quarter sessions would sit in judgment and determine what the true value was, and that would be taken as true value for compensation. His object was to fix clearly that the basis of compensation should be the value at the time when this Act was passed and not the value when subsequent advantages had accrued. It was obviously quite impossible after a few years to say what was the value of a public-house at the time when the Act was passed. But if they took the value once and for all and recorded it there was no going back on it. That, he thought, had been recommended by the Majority Report of Lord Peel's Commission as well as by the minority of the Commission.

To come to the next part of his Amendment, he considered that as a basis of compensation ten years purchase of the difference between the licensed value and the non-licensed value of the house was ample value on which to award compensation for a precarious interest. As the property had been held in the past, it could be forfeited for misconduct or at the discretion of the magistrates, and he thought the ten years purchase was an ample amount to allow as a maximum, but he did not think it necessarily followed that every house to be extinguished should get that maximum, He held that there were many houses where the magistrates shrank from enforcing the strict letter of the law and forfeiting a licence for bad management, but where nevertheless there was such substantial bad management that the house was not by any means entitled to the full measure of compensation to be given to the well managed, well built, and well placed house suitable to the trade. He thought the magistrates dealing with this question were eminently fitted to judge as to the quality of the house and how much should be abated from the compensation on account of what he called the dubious and suspicious character of the house. There was the thing called the "long pull," which he dared say some Members of the House knew better than he did, and there might be the supplying of drink to a constable on duty and also keeping open after legal hours. In fact, there were a great many things which might be enforced for a ground for refusing a licence, but which the magistrates were inclined to treat leniently and to pass over with a caution. It was quite obvious that these dubious houses which were continuously at the edge of the law and sometimes overstepping it, ought to have these facts taken into consideration in connection with the measure of compensation to be awarded.

Under the Bill the two questions of compensation and of the character of the House would be absolutely separated. The brewster magistrates would not be able to bring these two things before the same tribunal. Therefore they had not the same simple, easy, and familiar way of dealing with these things as before when the whole matter was in the discretion of the magistrates. Under this Bill the facts laid before the Court of quarter sessions and the Committee of quarter sessions would be different in the two different cases. He therefore felt very strongly that the other part of his Amendment was of importance, namely, that there should be power to vary compensation according to the judgment of the Court. He thought that most noble Lords would feel that these country gentlemen who had been accustomed to serve their county for a long time were fair-minded men bringing an adequate legal mind with common sense and fair play to the consideration of these cases, and that they were well able ao assess compensation. [Cries of "Divide."] He was sorry to detain their Lordships, but the measure of compensation was one of the most important parts of the Bill. He had a copy of the Bill marked as it passed through the House of Commons, and he saw that the whole of this Section II. which they were now discussing passed under the closure both in Committee and on Report, while important Amendments brought in by the Government which were not in the original Bill had never been discussed at all.

The next point in his Amendment was the apportionment of the compensation as finally awarded. He did not say that was so necessary a part of his Amendment as the others. He proposed that the authority in determining the compensation should also determine among the various interests involved how the money should be distributed. Later in the Bill there was a clause that a tenant should at any rate be compensated as if he was a yearly tenant, however short his tenure. There was another Amendment on the Paper to compensate the employees, but he did not attach the same importance to that. He had tried to be as brief as possible consistent with explaining the object of his Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 5, to leave out from the second word 'the' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'rateable value of the licensed premises and the rateable value the same premises would bear if not licensed at the time of the passing of this Act, capitalised at such sum not exceeding ten years purchase of such excess value as the Court of quarter sessions or their committee, or in a county borough the licensing authority, shall think reasonable to be distributed between the licensed holder and other persons interested in the licence as the licensing authority shall think equitable. Provided that if a person interested in licensed premises is dissatisfied with such rateable value as giving a true measure of the yearly value of the licensed premises, he may within three months of the passing of this Act declare what in his opinion was the true annual value before the passing of this Act of the said licensed premises, and the quarter sessions or their committee, or in a county borough the licensing authority, shall consider and determine what was the true annual value, and the value so determined shall be the value on the basis of which compensation shall be awarded.'"

LORD COLERIDGE said this Amendment dealt with two matters.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said if the whole of the noble Lord's Amendment were put it would cut out the whole of the noble Earl's. If the value of the premises were struck out the way was left clear for other Amendments.

LORD COLERIDGE said he was going to suggest that the question of capitalisation of value was a separate and independent matter which might form part of another Amendment.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said the House would see that if the whole of the sub-section was to stand part the next Amendment would be cut out.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I must take the Amendment as I find it. I have no complaint to make of the noble Earl for having explained his Amendment at some length, but I confess I do rather deprecate the kind of general charge of dishonesty which the noble Lord thought it right to make against a large number of persons engaged in a perfectly legitimate trade. I am sure he does not mean that everybody engaged in the liquor trade is dishonest.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said what he stated was that where premises were rated at a very much lower rate than the real rateable value it was dishonest.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The laws of this country provide a remedy for low rating, and it is the business of the overseers and officials at quarter sessions to see that property is rated at its full value, and to accuse a perfectly honest trade of dishonesty because the noble Lord thinks their property is in some cases rated too low is using language which I think he would hardly justify if he thought of it afterwards. The noble Lord has deprecated the method which we propose for assessing this compensation, and says the method of applying to the Inland Revenue is wrong. I think he misunderstands the provisions of the Bill when he says the Inland Revenue would never have to rate these particular houses because, belonging to a company, they were never subject to death duties. Sub-section 2 of Clause 2 says the amount

> "shall be determined by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue in the same manner, and subject to the like appeal to the High Court as on the valuation of an estate for the purpose of estate duty."

That is to say, they shall proceed on the same methods as when they have to value an estate when subject to death duties. That is all the clause says, and it appears a perfectly reasonable and straightforward proposition. Many things have been said about quarter sessions in these debates, and I observe the Inland Revenue now does not escape censure, but I think he would be a rash man who would lay it down that the highest Courts of the realm were really not competent to form an estimate of the value of licensed premises upon the basis of taking the value licensed and the value unlicensed. I think even the censorious mind of the noble Lord opposite will admit that the High Court is competent for such work, and I think it is preferable to rateable value, which is an annual thing. The basis which we propose is the capital value of the difference between the value of the house when licensed and when not licensed. As the compensation is to be a capital sum, it seems much more reasonable to estimate it on a capital value than to take rateable value, which is an annual sum, and necessitates your going one step further and then determining how many years purchase would be fair. That seems to be a very roundabout way of getting at capital value. I should, of course, deprecate ten years as a proper figure. It is hardly necessary for me to argue it. I do not wish the House to approve of rateable value at all, but in order to deal as respectfully as I can with the remarks of the noble Lord, I might just say that I do not think ten years purchase does represent the capital value which under the proposals of the Bill we are bound to pay in compensation to the licence-holder. The Government prefer the Inland Revenue and the method of the death duties rather than the rateable value which is proposed by the noble Lord.

The next and most important part of the Amendment is the proposal to stereotype the basis upon which to calculate compensation. The noble Lord proposes to stereotype it and take the value of the licensed house at the present moment and not the value of the licensed house when the licence is suppressed. I do not think that is an appropriate way to proceed when your Lordships reflect that the principle on which the provisions of this Bill are drawn is that a system of compulsory insurance should be set up. That is what our proposal amounts to. Compulsory insurance of course implies that the value of what a man loses should be insured to him, and the value of what he loses is the difference between the value it will be at the moment when the public-house is suppressed and the value it was the moment before, and that represents what he loses, what he compulsorily insured for, and what he ought to receive. I believe that what the noble Lord thinks is that under the Government proposal the liquor interest and the landlord might get too much money—that if the difference between the rateable value before the Act was passed and the then rateable value were taken the licensee would receive less than he would under the provisions of the Bill. That does not follow, because the change might be just the other way, and it might happen, and equally well, that instead of the licensed house increasing in value it would diminish in value and that under the proposals of the noble Lord the licensee and the interests connected with the licence would receive positively more by his proposal than under that of the Government. That, again, I think the noble Lord has not contemplated, and yet it is the necessary consequence of his Amendment, and indeed I think he gave an instance which told against himself. He said supposing the house is ill-conducted, but if that happens the compensation will greatly diminish under our proposal, because, when the time comes to calculate, it will be found that the house is an ill-conducted house, and therefore does not carry with it so much value as it formerly did, but under the noble Lord's proposal everything will have to be dated back to the time the Bill passes, when it was a well-conducted house, and therefore he will make it necessary for the compensation to be on the higher scale, as if it were a well-conducted house, whereas under our proposal the compensation would merely fall in proportion, or at any rate to some extent in proportion, to the ill-conduct of the house since the Act was passed, so that, I think, the noble Lord will see that his proposal would defeat his own ends, and for these reasons I am afraid the Government cannot accept the Amendment. He seemed to think that any difficulties which his proposal led to would be set right by the proviso at the end of his clause, but that is not so. The proviso, no doubt, is a protection to the liquor trade, but it would not be a protection to the compensating authority if that happened, which I have shown might happen, namely, that, in consequence of the ill-conduct of the house he ought to receive less compensation. On the contrary, nobody is entitled to apply this remedy under the noble Lord's proposal except those who are interested in the licence, and therefore they would not make an application in the case I am supposing, and therefore it would act as no remedy at all. Lastly, he proposed to provide the distribution of the money between the various interests, and I do not, on the face of it, think his proposal differs from the proposals submitted by His Majesty's Government. Therefore, on none of the three grounds can we accept the noble Lord's Amendment.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said the noble Marquess did not seem to understand that a house might be ill-conducted for the purpose of profit. He proposed that the maximum compensation should be ten years between the rateable value as licensed and the rateable value as unlicensed, but in order to meet the question of misconduct which would not enter into money value he proposed that——

[The remainder of the noble Lord's remarks were inaudible owing to Members calling out "Divide."]

The Marquess of RIPON said that before it was moved that these words stand part of the Bill, he wished to ask how they were going to carry out the proposal as it stood. How could they value what was the value of a thing twenty or thirty years back. Valuation was determined by the value of things which were constantly coming into the market. How was a valuer twenty years hence to say, with any accuracy, what would have been the value of a licence under an existing system of twenty years before.

***The Earl of ONSLOW**: I think the answer is a very simple one. As the Bill originally stood when introduced in the other House, the clause ran that the compensation was to be fixed as if this Act had not been passed. If it had come up in that form, the criticism of the noble Marquess would have been very well founded, but it has been altered in the direction that appears upon the Paper to-night, and I think it is quite clear that the intention of the Bill is that the conditions shall remain the same during the whole time whenever compensation is paid—that is to say, that when the Commissioners of Inland Revenue are called upon to decide how the compensation should be fixed they have got to consider how the licence would be affected by the conditions which are in existence at the present moment. We all know what those conditions are. The licence is subject to an expectancy of a renewal, although it is not necessary that it should be renewed, and all they have to take into consideration is what is the value of the licence, as if it were liable to be refused on the same grounds on which it can be refused now. I think it will be quite easy for the Inland Revenue to determine the value.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," resolved in the affirmative.

***Earl** GREY moved to leave out, on page 2, lines 6 and 7, the words "calculated as if the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were applicable." He said he felt so deeply upon this question that he trusted their Lordships, even at that late hour, would give him a patient hearing. The words which he moved to omit were incorporated in the Bill in the House of Commons at a very late stage, he believed they were not in the Bill as amended in Committee, but were only incorporated on the Report stage. The words that the compensation should be as if this Act had not been passed referred in most people's minds not only to the expectancy of renewal and questions of tenure, but also to the measures of value at the time of the passing of this Act. This question was asked in the House of Commons of the Colonial Secretary. Mr. Whittaker, who he did not think had made any mis-statements of fact, because he knew this question from A to Z, stated in the House of Commons that the on-licences in England and Wales had declined 30 per cent. in proportion to population between the years 1883 and 1903, twenty years, yet the amount of beer sold in the houses that remained averaged 50 per cent. more per house, thus showing that although the number of houses was reduced, the average quantity of liquor consumed had enormously increased. The natural way of assessing a public-house was on the normal amount of business that it did, and it was evident that if the average consumption of beer increased by 50 per cent. in twenty years, although the number of houses had declined by 30 per cent., then the houses were steadily going up in value. His Majesty's Government were asked if they were going to compensate men for the additional monopoly value, which belonged to the State. Mr. Lyttelton, in reply said—

> "The hon. Member says they will get an increased value by reason of the extinction of other licences and he declares that they will be in a position to get better compensation by reason of that. The House should take note of the important clause in the Bill which provides that compensation payable for the extinction of a licence is to be calculated as before the passing of this Act. It should not be forgotten that this moment of time is taken to deal with the principle of compensation, and therefore the undue appreciation which will result from the value of the licence feared by Mr. Whittaker seems to me to be unfounded."

That was not only the view of a distinguished member of the Cabinet but of a distinguished lawyer, and every one was justified in reading into those words that it was not intended to give more than the value of the house at the time of the passing of the Act.

He had in that House and out of it proclaimed his belief that this was a great temperance measure, because he saw in it a means of securing the certainty that all licences created after the passing of this Bill would be given to trust organisations, who would manage them as a trust for the benefit of the whole community. That proposal was very dear to him, because for the last three years he had given much time to an effort to build up, with the support of the Bishop of Chester and other friends, public-house trust companies in every county of England, so that they might have an organisation established which might go before the licensing authorities and say to them that if it were decided to grant new licences they claimed that they should give these new licences, not to a private individual for his personal gain but to a trust organisation, which would, under conditions approved by the licensing authorities, undertake to manage them in the interests of the community at large. It occurred to them who had been doing spade work in this direction—and he believed if it had not been for their work the fourth clause would have been very difficult to administer to-day—that if they could build a ringed fence round the existing licences of England and Wales they were doing no small temperance work. If this Bill had been passed thirty years ago it was his firm conviction that millions of pounds which were now going into the pockets of brewers and distillers would have been appropriated to public purposes. It was because he was so pleased to see the amended words of the fourth clause, that made it absolutely certain that licensing authorities should bring all new licences under the principle of disinterested control, that he said that this Bill, for that reason alone, was a great beneficial measure, but when he saw that the other words in the Bill which were interpreted by Mr. Lyttelton to mean that the compensation to be given to the holders of existing licences should be measured by the value that the house enjoyed at a time before the passing of the Act, he said here was a Bill which would not only bring new licences under disinterested management but would provide machinery to enable them to transfer from the trade to the trust existing licences, and so by degrees Gothenburg the entire country. He thought the supporters of the Bill, and he was quite sure the critics of the Bill, had not realised the great advantage which would result from this power. But the value of the provisions of this Bill which would enable quarter sessions to Gothenburg entire districts depended on the amount of compensation to be paid.

It might be said that in some cases the value of licenses would diminish, and therefore it was desirable that the compensation should be measured by the value of the house at the time of suppression. It might happen, no doubt, that here and there the trade of a house might diminish, but in such few instances they were not justified in paying the slightest regard to them. It was a certainty from which they could not escape that the value of existing houses would steadily increase, and they would be doing the very things they denounced in terms of holy horror unless they arranged the compensation to which a man should be entitled as the value at the time of the passing of the Act, and not at the time of suppression.

He had told the noble Marquesses on the Government Bench that unless they amended this Bill they would be guilty of the crime of giving to the brewers or owners of the existing public-houses a monopoly value which they had now in their power to secure to the community. Were they going to secure this monopoly value to the public or not? They could do it without one atom of injustice to anyone. If they were faithful to their own speeches that night they had no option but to accept his Amendment or to introduce an Amendment of their own fixing the compensation to which licensed houses should be entitled at present values. He had a right to earnestly appeal to His Majesty's Government to meet him if possible on this case. He did not believe that the 4th Clause could work if it were not for the trust companies that his friends had been able to establish all over the country. He begged to move his Amendment, in the earnest hope that the Government would accept it.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 6 and 7, to leave out the words, 'calculated as if the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were applicable'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

THE EARL OF ABERDEEN said they all would sympathise with his noble friend's appeal to the Government, although he somewhat weakened his case by his vote on the Amendment of the most rev. Primate. He told the Government if they would not give him a pledge he would feel bound to support the most rev. Primate. He was afraid he did not get the pledge. He hoped the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, in his reply would clear up the question whether the value of the licence was to be based on the value at the time of the passing of the Act or at the time of the suppression of the licence. In his last speech the noble Marquess seemed to argue rather that the estimate was to be at the time of the suppression of the licence, but the Bill seemed to state at the time of the passing of the Act.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Lord is quite correct. The Bill as it stands provides that the basis of compensation shall be the difference between the value of the house with a licence and its value without a licence at the time of its suppression. I hope that is clear. With regard to the speech of the noble Earl, he knows very well that we all of us take the greatest interest in his experiment of trust public-houses, and I think that the noble Earl, if I may say so with great respect, ought to be more appreciative of the action of His Majesty's Government in rendering possible a vast extension of his system which it never could have got on its own initiative, and which it would have been quite impossible to get as a private venture without the assistance of an Act of Parliament. I do not decry the value of the experiment of the noble Earl. I think he has been very gallant; he has struggled against immense difficulties, and I am surprised at the success which he has achieved. But the Bill we have submitted, the methods of compensation, the powers given to quarter sessions to suppress licences, and the fact that quarter sessions can, if the noble Earl can persuade them, help him, will enable him to push his system in a way in which it could not have been pushed otherwise. I think the noble Earl should not be so capricious and so changeable in his attitude to the Bill as to say that if he cannot have his own way in this instance, his whole attitude towards the Bill will be changed.

EARL GREY: I only made an appeal to the Government to be faithful to their speeches and not to give monopoly value to those who were not entitled to it.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The reason for compensation is that these licence-holders have a pecuniary interest in their licences which belongs to them equitably, and for which they are entitled to compensation if it is destroyed. That is the basis upon which we proceed. The natural consequence and conclusion of that premiss would at first sight appear to be that if the State takes away that which equitably belongs to one of His Majesty's subjects the State ought to pay for it; but we do not propose that the State should pay for it. What do we propose? We propose that the trade should pay for it. I can quite conceive a brewer arising in this House and saying, "That is very unfair; here is a Government proposing to take away the rights which belong to a licensee and they do not propose to pay for them out of the resources of the State but out of our pockets." The trade will, of course, get back a certain part of their contribution in the increased trade given to remaining houses, otherwise I think if the noble Earl will look at it justly and fairly he will see that if the trade get the increment which will result from the suppression of a particular house, they will only be treated fairly. Why should they pay for what they lose by the act of the State?

EARL GREY: They are compensated.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl has not yet seen the point, if I may venture to say to. My noble friend the Leader of the House explained to the House that all you do is to give the dog a bite off his own tail. There is a definite pecuniary value which is taken away from the licensee. Instead of the State paying for its own act, it makes the trade pay. Therefore the State does not pay and the whole burden is thrown on the licensee. The licensee is deprived of what belongs to him, and the State pays nothing for it. That is all thrown on the trade itself. But for the fact that they will get the increased value which results to the remaining houses, I am afraid the brewers would come and say, "You have committed a great injustice," and therefore I am afraid the very basis of the noble Earl's argument breaks down. I always feel when an appeal is made with such evident earnestness to His Majesty's Government that it is not a thing to be brushed aside, and I do not desire to do so. But I think the noble Earl will see if he reflects that in this respect we are following the path of justice, and therefore I do not feel my way clear to accept the proposal. If the noble Earl is able now to persuade us or at a future stage I shall be quite delighted to consider his proposition, but I am afraid I see no prospect at present of His Majesty's Government changing their minds.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said he failed to follow the conclusions at which the noble Marquess had arrived. He asked their Lordships to put aside all the other questions imported into the discussion of this Amendment and just to consider what the Amendment was. If the words which his hon. friend proposed to leave out were omitted, then the compensation to be paid would be the sum equal to the difference between the value of the licensed premises immediately before the passing of this Act and the value which these premises would bear if they were not licensed premises. The whole point was this, in estimating the compensation were they to take the value at the passing of the Act or the value at the time at which the individual house was abolished?

Let them suppose there were six public-houses in a village, and two belonged to each of three brewing companies. Three of these were abolished, and then there was paid in compensation a sum equal to the value of these three houses. These houses were compensated and they were gone. The other three houses remained. Did their Lordships imagine that one half of the drink would be stopped? If it was not, it was quite clear that the portion of the drink which did not stop and which he expected would not be far short of a half, would go to the other houses? When the time came at which one of these other houses was to be abolished, the compensation to be paid was the value of the licence at the time it was abolished; that was to say, they took into consideration the traffic which had moved from the other houses, and paid for it over again. All he contended was that they were paying over and over again in virtue of what they had already paid compensation for. He had listened to the noble Marquess with every desire to be convinced, but not one word he said appeared to him to interfere with the conclusion which seemed to him to speak for itself, and all he could say was that if the compensation was to increase gradually as the houses diminished, he was afraid the rate of abolition would come to be more beautifully and beautifully less until it came down to nothing.

*THE EARL OF CREWE said that the Amendment brought them back to their old friend, "monopoly value." If this value was, in the opinion of the Government, that kind of property which they had over and over again told the House it was they were perfectly logical in refusing to diminish it in any way. At the same time he desired to say that it raised a serious state of things if it was the opinion of the Government that this monopoly value once given away by a foolish act of the State was for ever and ever to remain in the hands of those who possessed it at this moment without the possibility of diminution of any kind.

EARL CARRINGTON said that although he belonged to one of the few counties in which his noble friend Lord Grey's scheme did not work, yet he was glad to hear from the noble Marquess that Lord Grey's proposal was not to be brushed aside. He thought everybody recognised that he and the Bishop of Chester were two hardworking socialists, as his hon. friend behind him said. What did Lord Grey want to do? As he understood the Amendment, it would require an immediate valuation of all licensed premises, and, what would be more important, a return of alcoholic liquors sold. He reminded the Government that this proposal was suggested in Mr. Butcher's Bill last year, and it could not be said that that Bill was hostile to the trade generally. He trusted that the Amendment would receive further consideration at the hands of the Government.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: What this Bill proposes is that a certain number of persons engaged in the liquor trade should be compelled to insure against the actual loss which they will sustain in the event of their business being taken away from them. What I understand is proposed by my noble friend Lord Grey, and those who have supported him, is that compensation should be paid not for the actual loss sustained by the person whose licence is taken away from him, but that he should be compensated on terms assessed with reference to the value of the premises at the time of the passing of this Act. I cannot help thinking that that is not an arrangement which would work out fairly. Supposing a licence to be taken away from the licensee in the year 1910; it is no compensation to him to be given a sum of money representing the value of that licence in 1904. There may be a wide difference between the two sums. The value of the licence may have risen or fallen. I am afraid we cannot accept the Amendment, and it seems to me to involve this further difficulty; that if it were adopted it would entail on us the duty of instituting a general valuation of all the licensed premises in the country. That would be an enormous work which would be in great measure superfluous, seeing that only some of the licensed houses would form the subject of compensation.

LORD COLERIDGE said that in the Return moved for by Mr. Cochrane he found a complete list of all the public-houses affected by the Bill, with their valuation, and with the amount ascertained which they would be called upon to pay under the Bill. Therefore this enormous work which was to occupy such a vast amount of machinery and take such a very long time had already been done, and appeared in a Paper which he held in his hand. It was obvious that the arguments addressed from that part of the House had hitherto been entirely unanswered. He suggested that if the debate were adjourned the Government might be able to furnish themselves with a better class of arguments in view of the statement that had been made in another place by the Colonial Secretary. If that were done, their Lordships might meet to-morrow at three o'clock instead of half-past four.

***Earl SPENCER**: I really do hope the noble Marquess will consider this. My noble friend who moves this Amendment has a very great claim on the Government, though I am afraid I do not agree with the votes he has already given in support of the Government. This is a matter of such enormous importance and will involve such gigantic sums of money that I do hope the Government will take this Amendment into consideration and not refuse what I think is the exceedingly reasonable request of the noble Earl. Their votes, we know, are overwhelming, but they might postpone the matter if they will consider it on Report. I think we have had only one very trifling concession from the noble Marquess, and he might consider this, and, if possible, hold out some hope of dealing with it in a somewhat more liberal way.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I am very sorry indeed if my imperfect powers of argument have not made the matter clear to the noble and learned Lord, Lord Coleridge, and to the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition. I did try to advance an argument which I hoped would have had some weight with the noble Lord. It seems that that has not been the case, and I cannot hope to succeed better by repeating my argument. I therefore can only say that I think it would be right for the House to come to a decision. It is quite true the subject is a most difficult one, one of the most difficult in the Bill, and I frankly tell the noble Earl that if he can succeed in convincing His Majesty's Government, we shall be very glad to fall in with the opinion of such a temperance reformer as the noble Earl. The noble Earl's opportunities are not exhausted by this discussion; he can bring up the subject again on the Report stage.

Earl BEAUCHAMP: In order to give the Government an opportunity of consulting with their colleagues in the other House, moved that the House be resumed. He contended that the pledge which had been given by the Colonial Secretary in the House of Commons had not been kept.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I rise to order. Your Lordships are very liberal in matters of this kind, but there is a very great inconvenience in quotations from the other House of Parliament. I do not know what passed there, and it is no business of your Lordships' House. I do not know under what circumstances this assurance was given, and I must ask your Lordships to agree that this is out of order.

***Earl SPENCER**: I agree that my noble friend is perhaps slightly out of order. If he had simply said he had heard on high authority that a certain statement had been made by one of His Majesty's Ministers he would have been in order. But I think he is perfectly justified in continuing his argument and moving the adjournment.

Earl BEAUCHAMP said he would move that the House be resumed and meet again at any time which met the convenience of the noble Marquess the Leader of the House. In another place a member of the Government had definitely pledged His Majesty's Ministers that the compensation to be paid should be calculated as before the passing of this measure.

Moved, "That the House be resumed."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 37; Not-Contents, 85.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Argyll, D.

Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E. [*Teller*]
Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller*]
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lytton, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.
Temple, E.

Falmouth, V.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen*)
Halifax, V.

Chester, L. Bp.
Lichfield, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. David's, L. Bp.

Barnard, L.
Brassey, L.
Coleridge, L.
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*)
Farrer, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly*)
Monkswell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran*)
Wenlock, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry*) (*L. President*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal*)

Northumberland, D.
Wellington, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Camden, M.
Exeter, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain*)
Bathurst, E.
Cawdor, E.
Coventry, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*)
Drogheda, E.
Eldon, E.
Feversham, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lathom, E.
Londesborough, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Onslow, E.
Powis, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller*]
Westmeath, E.
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*)
Knutsford, V.

Peterborough, L. Bp.

Addington, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Belper, L.
Bolton, L.
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
Deramore, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall*)
Forester, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L
Harris, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore*)
Lawrence, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Newton, L.
Raglan, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rossmore, L.
Sinclair, L.
Suffield, L.
Tredegar, L.
Ventry, L.
Windsor, L
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

On Question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause" their Lordships divided:—Contents, 83; Not-Contents, 38.

CONTENTS.

Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry*) (*L. President*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal*)

Northumberland, D.
Wellington, D.
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Camden, M.
Exeter, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain*)
Bathurst, E.
Cawdor, E.
Coventry, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry*)
Drogheda, E.
Eldon, E.
Feversham, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lathom, E.

Londesborough, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Onslow, E.
Powis, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller*]
Westmeath, E.
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore*)
Knutsford, V.

Addington, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Belper, L.
Bolton, L.
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw L.
Deramore, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall*)
Forester, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L.
Harris, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Errol*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore*)
Lawrence, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Newton, L.
Raglan, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rossmore, L.
Sinclair, L.
Suffield, L.
Tredegar, L.
Ventry, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Argyll, D.

Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Crewe, E.
Grey, E. [*Teller*]
Kimberley, E.
Lytton, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.
Temple, E.

Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen*)
Halifax, V.

Chester, L. Bp.
Lichfield, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.
St. David's, L. Bp.
Salisbury, L. Bp.
Balfour, L.
Barnard, L.
Brassey, L.
Coleridge, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*)
Farrer, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Monkswell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran*) [*Teller*]
Wenlock, L.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I think it may be convenient if we now adjourn; and as we have still a considerable part of the Bill to consider I suggest we might adjourn until half-past three to-morrow.

EARL SPENCER assented.

House resumed, and to be again in Committee to-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES.

Report of the Select Committee made; to be printed; and to be considered on Tuesday next. (No. 180.)

House adjourned at five minutes before One o'clock to half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 4th August, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill. Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to.

Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [Lords] (by Order). As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Glasgow and South Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill; Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords]. Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]. Order [18th July], That the Bill be read the third time, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Selby Urban District Council Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to Amendments to—Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; Lothians Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make provision for the transfer of property and other matters consequent upon the dissolution of districts and Poor Law Unions, or the addition of one Poor Law Union to another." [Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituted "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Aberdeen City Improvement." [Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [No. 294.]

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. To be considered to-morrow.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Arlesey; Llanrhyddbad; Polton; and West Harton; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-second Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1902–3, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Thirty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

Copy presented, of Revised Estimate, Class 7, Vote 5 (Ireland Development Grant) [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 307.]

PUBLIC REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ROYAL NAVY).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th May; *Sir John Colomb*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 308.]

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd August; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 309.]

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st August; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 306.]

ARMY (MILITIA).

Copy presented, of Further Regulations relating to the Militia [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY RESERVE.

Copy presented, of Further Regulations relating to the Army Reserve [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURT JURISDICTION (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the question of Metropolitan Police Court Jurisdiction in Middlesex, with Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894 (VESSELS DETAINED).

Copy presented, of Return of all ships ordered by the Board of Trade, or its officers, during the period from the 1st July, 1903, to the 30th June, 1904, to be provisionally detained as unsafe, together with Summaries, etc. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAMWAYS AND LIGHT RAILWAYS (STREET AND ROAD).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd July]; *Mr. Gerald Balfour*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 310.]

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Copy presented, of Thirteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 311.]

BANKRUPTCY.

Copy presented, of Twenty-first General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 312.]

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1903. Part I. Criminal Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th June, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (EAST INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIA MAILS).

Copy ordered, "of Contract, dated the 25th day of July, 1904, between the Postmaster-General and the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company for the conveyance of the East India, China, and Australia Mails, being supplemental to the Contract dated the 25th day of May, 1897 (H.C. No. 259, of Session 1897); together with copy of Treasury Minute thereon, dated the 2nd day of August, 1904."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Display of Party Emblems on Licensed Premises in Ireland.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that some time ago two publicans in county

Derry were cautioned by the police for flying the Union Jack from their premises, he will explain under what circumstances Party emblems were recently permitted on licensed premises in Roundstone, county Galway.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The first part of the Question presumably refers to an incident that took place at Magherafelt in July, 1903. The publicans were cautioned against displaying flags of any description on an occasion which was a Party one; they were not cautioned for hanging out the Union Jack only. I have stated that Party emblems were not displayed at Roundstone.

Disturbances at Milford.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to what took place at Milford on the return of the Bishops of Ossory and Galway, Clogher, Raphoe, Achonry, Elphin, and Meath, with other ecclesiastical dignitaries, from the celebrations at Armagh on the evening of 24th July; if he can state what occurred at Milford; what provision was made by the police authorities for the protection of visitors on the occasion; and whether a prompt inquiry will be made into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) My attention has been directed to a complaint that on the 24th July stones were thrown at two of the carriages containing ecclesiastical dignitaries, when passing through the village of Milford. It has also been represented that a revolver was fired behind one of the carriages. Special precautions had been taken by the police for preservation of the peace on the occasion, and the road was patrolled by a number of additional men detailed for the purpose. It was understood beforehand by the police authorities that the carriages would return together, and arrangements were made for the provision of a travelling escort of four men on a car to accompany the carriages. They did not, however, return together, and consequently the escort was unable to accompany each carriage or group of carriages. The police at Milford did not observe the stone throwing, which occurred after darkness had set in, and when attention was drawn to the matter every effort was at once made to trace the offenders. Active inquiry is still being pursued. The incident is much to be regretted.

Rate of Interest on Loans for Erection of Labourers' Cottages in Ireland.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what rates of interest were charged on loans for labourers' cottages in Ireland prior to 3rd March, and what rates are now charged; and at whose instance and on what grounds the increased rate was imposed; whether he is aware that the effect has been the abandonment of schemes for the erection of cottages by numerous district councils; and whether, in view of the failure of the Government to pass comprehensive legislation on the subject this session, he will make representations to the Treasury as to the necessity for reducing the rates of interets now charged.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The rates of interest charged prior to 3rd March on loans issued out of the Local Loans Fund were —

3¼ per cent. when the period of repayment did not exceed 30 years.

3½ per cent. when the period of repayment did not exceed 40 years.

3¾ per cent. when the period of repayment did not exceed 50 years.

The rates now charged are --

3½ per cent. when the period does not exceed 20 years.

3¾ per cent. when the period does not exceed 30 years.

4 per cent. when the period does not exceed 40 years.

4¼ per cent. when the period does not exceed 50 years

The Local Government Board has no information that schemes have been abandoned by district councils for the reason assigned. The rates of interest are fixed by the Treasury in pursuance of The Public Works Loans Act, 1897, and the question of a variation of the rates is entirely one for that Department.

Issue of Up-to-date Edition of Fiscal Blue-book.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will be able to issue shortly a revised edition of the Fiscal Blue-book of last year, with the figures brought up to date, and any supplementary information bearing upon the subject which his Department may have been able to obtain.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Supplementary information on certain subjects bearing on British and foreign trade and industrial conditions is being prepared by the Board of Trade for publication. It is not proposed at present to publish a revised edition of the volume referred to in the Question, but the opportunity will be taken to revise and bring up to date some of the tables published in it.

Soldiers in India and Elsewhere—Extension of Service.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many soldiers who had completed two years service and were entitled to extend their service elected to do so in 1904 in India and elsewhere, respectively; and how many so situated did not extend in India and elsewhere.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The following statement shows 1) the number of three years men (rank and file) of cavalry, artillery, and infantry units on the strength of the Army on 1st July, 1904, who had completed two year service; (2) number in (1) who elected to extend their service; (3) number in (1) who did not extend their service:—

Distribution.	(1) Total number of rank and file with over two years service.	(2) Number of those in (1) who extended service.	(3) Number of those in (1) who did not extend.
India	2,035	1,192	843
Elsewhere . . .	10,246	1,823	8,423
Total	12,281	3,015	9,266

Delay in Construction of Cromore-Gravir Road (Island of Lewis).

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the cause of the delay in the construction of the Cromore-Gravir Road, Island of Lewis.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) As I informed the hon. Member on the 25th of April last†, the Congested Districts Board had agreed to offer the sum of £2,700 as their contribution for the construction of this road. Inquiries have since been made, and the Board were informed by the county clerk on 20th July that this matter was to be considered by the Road Board during the following week. Up to the present date no decision as to the acceptance of the grant offered by the Congested Districts Board towards the cost of this road has been received.

The New Edition of the Book of Common Prayer.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, in the new edition of the Book of Common Prayer, alterations have been made in the punctuation of the Annexed Book which materially affect the interpretation of the text of that document in some important particulars, especially as regards the definition of a Sacrament in the Catechism and the rendering of the Ornaments Rubric; also whether he is aware that the Act of Uniformity has been omitted from the smaller issues of the same edition; and what action, if any, he proposes to take in view of these irregularities.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii, 1029.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) As far as I can see, this Question does not raise any matter not dealt with in the series of Questions which were put by my hon. friend and answered by me in the autumn of 1902, and which led to the Return on the subject issued in March, 1903. I am afraid that I have nothing to add, but I may perhaps refer specially to the Answer which I gave on the 28th October, 1902.†

Order under the Dockyard Ports Regulation Act at Plymouth.

MR. DUKE (Plymouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the terms of the recently published draft Order in Council, under the Dockyard Ports Regulation Act, 1865, for the regulation of the port of Plymouth, with regard to the probable effect of the proposed regulations upon the means of livelihood of the fishermen of the port; and whether, before the draft Order is submitted for the consideration of the King in Council, means will be taken to ascertain by local inquiry the views of those who are likely to be affected by the proposed regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) No alteration in the existing regulations prohibiting fishing in certain areas for the safety of navigation has been proposed in the new Order in Council, and, therefore, it is not considered necessary to hold any local inquiry. A request has been received from the town council for the fishermen to be allowed to make use of certain areas within which fishing is already prohibited, but it is absolutely essential to the free and unimpeded navigation of the port by large vessels that this prohibition should be maintained. An objection has also been raised to a new regulation prohibiting the anchorage of fishing vessels in Deadman's Bay. This new regulation was inserted at the request of the Cattewater Commissioners, and the Admiralty are now communicating with the Commissioners on the subject.

Elementary Education—Proportion of Cost borne by Local and Imperial Funds.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will give the relative proportion (or percentage) of the cost of elementary education in England and Wales, borne by local and Imperial funds, during the last three years.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) So far as expenses of elementary education, otherwise than for buildings and for administration, are concerned, the following are the official figures for the three years named:—

Year.	Total expenditure.	Met from Government Grants.	Met from School Board rates.	Met from voluntary subscriptions.	Met from endowments, fees, bank overdrafts, and other local sources.
	£	£	£	£	£
1899—1900	12,045,000	8,039,000	2,599,000	801,000	606,000
		= 66·7%	= 21·6%	= 6·7%	= 5·0%
1900—1901	12,557,000	8,089,000	2,966,000	834,000	668,000
		= 64·4%	= 23·6%	= 6·7%	= 5·3%
1901—1902	13,005,000	8,275,000	3,258,000	876,000	596,000
		= 63·6%	= 25·1%	= 6·7%	= 4·6%
1901—1902	Government Grants 63·6%		Local Sources 36·4%		

The Board have at present no collected figures as to the amounts expended by local education authorities since the Act of 1902 came into operation. But the Imperial contribution given in the above column has been increased by £1,248,000. This will of course alter the proportion of expenditure as between Imperial and local funds, but it is impossible to say what the proportion will precisely be until figures are obtainable of the moneys expended from local sources by the authorities under the new state of things. If the expenditure from other than Imperial sources were remaining the same, the proportion of the total expenditure borne by Imperial funds would, owing to the increase of the Exchequer Grant given in 1902, have been increased from 63·6 per cent. above stated to 73·2 per cent. and the burden to be borne by local funds decreased from 36·4 per cent. to 26·8 per cent., so that the Exchequer would have been bearing practically three-quarters of the burden of maintenance of public elementary schools. As, however, most of the local authorities are quite properly improving the education in their schools and are expending somewhat larger sums than were before spent from sources other than Imperial funds, it is not possible at present to state the exact proportion now borne by Imperial and local funds respectively on maintenance, but there can be no doubt that the Exchequer still bears considerably the larger share of this burden.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxiii, 943.

Preservation as an Ancient Monument of Ardandra Castle (County Longford).

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury to state the result of his inquiries with regard to Ardandra Castle, in county Longford; and will he now direct that it be scheduled under the Ancient Monuments Protection Act with a view to restoration and preservation.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I informed the hon. Member, on the 18th February last,† that no such castle is known to the Commissioners of Public Works. I can only repeat the offer I then made to direct inquiry into the matter if the locality is precisely indicated.

Acheen War—Suggested Pacific Intervention of Great Britain.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the duration of the Acheen War, which has now lasted some thirty years, and having regard to the suffering which this has entailed on the natives of a small corner of Sumatra, His Majesty's Government will use their good offices with the Continental Powers to arrange that the dispute between the Government of the Netherlands and the Sultan of Acheen be referred to the arbitration of the Hague Peace Tribunal.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer given on 28th July,‡ to which I have nothing further to add.

Increase of Russian and Austrian Officers of Macedonian Gendarmerie.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received official information to the effect that the Governments of Russia and Austria have increased or intimated their intention to increase the number of their officers in Macedonia supervising the *gendarmerie* there; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government propose to increase the number of their *gendarmerie* officers also.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) An intimation has just reached us that the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Ambassadors have asked for an increase in the number of their officers employed in reorganising the Macedonian *gendarmerie.* His Majesty's Government consider that they have a right to demand equality with the other Powers in regard to any such increase, but the number of officers required for each district must of course be governed by the circumstances and extent of its area. His Majesty's Government are anxious that no unnecessary burdens should be imposed upon Turkey, and, if an all-round increase of the European staff be decided upon, it may possibly be found more economical and useful to employ any surplus officers, who are not required in the districts already comprised in the *gendarmerie* scheme, either in supervising a gradual extension of the scheme to other areas not yet included, or in affording assistance to the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxx., 260.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 1464.

Turkish authorities in other departments of the administration.

Prevention of Decomposition in Meat during Transit from Abroad.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board if he can state the various methods by which decomposition is arrested in meat from abroad to our shores, and if he is aware that boric acid or boracic acid is frequently injected into the carcases of animals for export at the time of killing, and that experiments have been tried, with the result that on arrival carbonate of soda is found to effervesce upon the meat so treated; and whether he has any official reports on the effect of partaking of boric or boracic acid upon human beings; and, if so, will he lay them upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I understand that the ordinary methods by which decomposition is prevented or arrested in meat coming from abroad are (1) cold storage, (2) salting, with or without drying, and (3) preservation in cans. According to the evidence given before the Departmental Committee on Food Preservatives, borax and boric acid (which is called boracic acid) are largely used for the preservation of bacon, ham, sausages, and other preserved meats, but not by means of injection into carcases of animals at the time of killing. No evidence appears to have been given to show that carcases of butchers' meat are preserved in this way. I have no information as to the alleged experiments, nor have any reports been made to me on the effect of partaking of boric or boracic acid upon human beings. The hon. Member is probably aware of the Report of the Departmental Committee to which I have referred. It has been laid before Parliament.

Defective Ventilation of Lobby Telegraph Office.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether his attention has been called to the bad ventilation in the telegraph office in the Members' Lobby, particularly during the recent hot weather; and whether he will endeavour, before next session, to introduce the necessary improvements.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) This seems to be a question of accommodation rather than ventilation. The matter shall be considered in the recess, in case any improvement may be possible.

Painting by Watts in the Grand Committee Room.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether his attention has been called to the condition of the painting by Watts, R.A., now hanging in a Committee Room; and whether he will arrange for its being removed to more appropriate quarters, or if this is not possible, he will consult a reliable expert as to its condition.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) This picture was in 1897 re-stretched by an expert and placed in the Grand Committee Room, as the only position available. The First Commissioner does not know of any other convenient situation in the building where it could be given sufficient wall-space. He proposes to ask for expert advice as to its condition.

Appointment of Additional Sub-Inspector of Railways.

Mr. BELL (Derby): To ask the President of the Board of Trade when does he propose to appoint the second additional sub-inspector of railways which he promised last year, and for whom salary is charged in the Estimates.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The existing staff is fully equal to dealing with the current work, and the necessity for the appointment of the additional sub-inspector, for whom provision is made in the Estimates, has not yet arisen. I am watching the development of the work, and shall make an appointment as soon as additional staff is required.

Business of Bangor, Portrush, and Ballymoney Post Offices.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he would state the percentage of business transacted in the post offices of Bangor, county Down, and of Portrush and of Ballymoney, county Antrim, respectively; and, seeing that the postal authorities find that the offices in Ballymoney and Portrush are too small for the volume of business, whether the authorities are contemplating the enlargement of the office accommodation in these latter towns in the near future.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley*). The hon. Member's Question necessitates some local inquiry, which is being made. I will communicate the result to him as soon as possible.

Pay of Assistant Postmasters.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Civil Service clerks have to work only forty-eight hours a week; that they are paid at rate and one-half for all Sunday work; that they are entitled to an increase of pay at rate of £5 5s. a year till the maximum salary is reached; that they are paid full salary for six months in case of illness, and half salary for six months more; that they are paid sixpence an hour in addition to regular wages when absent from the offices at which they are regularly employed, and that they receive a pension when retiring from the service; that assistant postmasters have greater responsibilities than ordinary Civil Service clerks; that they are compelled to work fifty-six hours each week; that they receive no pay for Sunday work; that they are paid a fixed salary of 12s. to 15s. a week; that all pay is stopped from them during illness; that they are paid only three half-pence an hour when doing duty at offices other than those to which they are attached; and that they are not entitled to any pension; and, if so, whether, in view of the difference in the conditions of service of assistant postmasters and Civil servants, he will allow the former to be included with the others in the postal service whose alleged grievances will be made the subject of investigation by the Committee of Inquiry which is about to be appointed.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It is not clear to what class of post office servants the hon. Member is referring. I am not aware of any class bearing the designation of "assistant postmasters," nor am I aware that any Committee of Inquiry is about to be appointed to investigate the alleged grievances of the postal service. If the hon. Member will give me further particulars I shall be glad to give him any information I can.

Free Delivery of Telegrams in Irish Villages.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will make an order that, whenever any portion of a village in any part of Ireland comes within the limit of free delivery of telegrams, the whole of that village may be regarded as within the limit.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that persons living in part of the village of Irishtown, county Mayo, can have telegrams delivered free, while those who live in the other portion of it have to pay a sum of one shilling for the delivery of each telegram, he will consider the advisability of ordering telegrams addressed to persons residing in any part of the village to be delivered free, as the whole length of the place is only about 300 yards.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The limit of free delivery of telegrams is fixed by statutory regulations, and I am unable to adopt the hon. Member's suggestion that exceptions should be allowed. This answers also Question 70.

Delivery of Letters at Irishtown, County Mayo.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that there is only one delivery of letters each day in Irishtown, county Mayo; and that the mid-day mails for Irishtown come to Ballindine Post Office, within three miles of the place; and, if so, whether he will order a mid-day delivery of letters at Irishtown in future.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Inquiry shall be made as to whether any improvement can be made in the mail service to Irishtown, and an answer shall be sent to the hon. Member.

Military Equipment Manufactured in India.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that it is the policy of the Government to make India, as far as possible, independent of assistance from home in the matter of war material, will he state the value of the equipments, other than guns and rifles, which have been manufactured in Indian Government factories and by private firms in India, respectively, during the last two years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I regret that I am unable to give the information asked for, as it would require considerable research.

Vacant Siemship of Cherra (Assam).

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has recently received a memorial from the people of the Cherra Native State, Assam, and from the ruling twelve clans of that State, urging that Chandra Singh, the nearest relative of Hajon Manick, the late siem (chief), should be elected to the siemship of Cherra; and, seeing that the election of the siem for the Khyrim Native State was recently decided by a majority of the votes of the Myntries, will he say whether there is any reason why the election to the Cherra siemship should not be decided under similar conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have received no memorial as to the siemship of Cherra since my Answer on the subject to the hon. Member of 18th February last.† There is nothing in the circumstances reported to me concerning the succession in Khyrim, which occurred in January last, to make me modify the opinion expressed in my Answer of the 18th February.

Report of the Indian Police Commission —Proposals of Indian Government.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India when he expects to receive from the Government of India their proposals relative to the Report of the Police of India; and will he state the cause of the delay on the part of the Government of India in sending in these proposals.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I cannot assign any date for the receipt of the proposals of the Government of India on the Report of the Indian Police Commission. It has been necessary to refer to local governments, and as the recommendations of the Report cover a very wide field the replies have, no doubt, required much consideration. I have urged the Government of India to expedite the submission of their proposals on the most important of the matters dealt with in the Report, and I have no reason to suppose that they will not address me on the earliest possible date.

Agricultural Banks in India.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to state the number of agricultural banks which have been established in each province of India up to the present time.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Answer is in the negative.

Recommendations of Indian Irrigation Commission.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state when the schemes recommended in the Report of the Irrigation Commission will be put in hand, and which schemes will be first proceeded with.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am awaiting a statement by the Government of India of their views regarding the action to be taken on the recommendations of the Indian Irrigation Commission. I have no information as to the order in which the schemes recommended by the Commission will be proceeded with; but, as stated in my reply to the hon. Member on the 28th ultimo,‡ the Government of India have provided in their forecast for 1904–5 for expenditure on some of the projects recommended by the Commission.

Drainage of Scariff River.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Board of Works has examined a portion of the Scariff River with a view to its drainage; and, if so, whether instructions will be given to have the entire river examined.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxx., 235.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 1450.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) A portion of the Scariff River was examined by one of the engineers of the Board of Works; but, as there is no question of the formation of a drainage board, nor of the expenditure of public money on the regulation of the river, no further action will be taken.

Committal of Lunatics—Fees of Dromore Petty Sessions Clerk.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state under what authority does the petty sessions clerk for Dromore and Dromara district make charges varying from £1 10s. to £3 when signing the necessary documents in committal of dangerous and other lunatics; whether he is aware that this petty sessions clerk received payment of £2 10s. from Joseph M'Cree, Turganbane, Dromore, brother of a dangerous lunatic, Scott M'Cree, who was committed to Downpatrick Lunatic Asylum on the 26th June last; and, if so, will he say what steps the authorities will take to have inquiry made into this and other charges, and to put a stop to this practice, and to have the moneys refunded.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) A representation on this effect was recently made by a man named Hunter to the registrar of petty sessions clerks, by whom the matter was personally investigated, and who satisfied himself that the complaint was entirely without foundation. The only fee charged in such cases is the statutory fee of a few shillings representing the value of the petty sessions stamps used. In the case of the committal of Scott M'Cree, the amount paid by Joseph M'Cree was 3s. 6d., and the latter has made a written statement to that effect.

Sale of the Marquess of Ely's Estates.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN, (Kilkenny): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have taken, or intend to take, any steps under Section 7 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, for the purchase of the estates of the Marquess of Ely in the counties of Fermanagh and Wexford, for the sale of which absolute orders were made by the Land Judge in November, 1902; and, if not, will he direct them to do so immediately; how many applications for reinstatement have been received by the Estates Commissioners from evicted tenants on each of these estates; and how many civil bill decrees for rent have been obtained against tenants on each of these estates since the 1st January, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I must ask the hon. Member to postpone this Question till Tuesday next, to enable inquiries to be made.

Irish National School Teachers' Reports.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the second division of first grade of national school teachers for the period ending 1903 show that at least two of the last three annual reports be marked excellent or very good; and, if so, will he explain how the award very good is made to cover a period when it did not appear as a printed instruction to inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Question is not very clear. Teachers were not promoted to the second division of first grade unless at least two of the three annual reports for the triennial period ended 31st March, 1903, were marked excellent or very good. In some of the forms of annual report, now obsolete, used by the inspectors the term very good was not provided for, and the case of any teacher whose promotion to a higher grade might be effected thereby was specially examined with the view of ascertaining whether such teacher merited promotion.

Water Supply of Crossgar, County Down.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the water supply of Crossgar, in the county Down, is unsatisfactory, and that two wells, completed a year ago, are not yet in use owing to a dispute as to the area of charge for the construction thereof; and, if so, whether the Local Government Board will take steps to ensure that the inhabitants of Crossgar will have the benefit of this new water supply as soon as possible.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) In December, 1902, in accordance with a resolution of the council, the Board fixed an area of charge for the expenses in connection with the provision of a water supply at Crossgar. Recently the council requested the Board to fix a more restricted area for the purpose, and was informed, in reply, that certain legal points in regard to the making of orders declaring areas of charge for sanitary expenses are not finally settled by the decision given in the Ballycastle case. Under the circumstances, and in view of the fact that another case is pending, the Board has decided to postpone for the present the consideration of applications such as the present. This, however, should not prevent the district council from proceeding with the execution of all necessary sanitary works in their district, as the question at issue will be dealt with at the earliest practicable date.

Sales to Tenants of Irish Land.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many million pounds worth of land has been sold in Ireland to the tenants through the Estates Commissioners, the Congested Districts Board, or by direct negotiation under the Land Act of 1903, up to 31st July ult.; and how many million pounds worth is under the consideration of the Estates Commissioners and the Congested Districts Board at the present time.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*)—

Irish Land Commission. Estates Commissioners.

Advances sanctioned:—

Direct Sales.	£
Agreements between landlord and tenant - -	2,467,709
Purchase of estates, Section 6	158,507
Do. Section 7	56,848
	£2,683,064

Applications pending decision:—

Direct Sales.	£
Agreements between landlord and tenant - -	5,611,524
Purchase of estates, Section 6	619,988
Do. Section 7	335,765
	£6,567,277

Congested Districts Board.

	£
Direct Sales to tenants, not through Land Commission	14,999
Sales to tenants through Land Commission - - -	142,928
Value of property purchased but not yet sold - -	894,947
Negotiations pending for purchase of land to the value of	143,874

Irish Estates—Enlargement of Tenants' Holdings.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the fact that on a representation being made to the Estates Commissioners or the Congested Districts Board that there are sufficient grazing lands on any estate to enlarge the holdings of tenants on that estate or a neighbouring one, or for the purpose of creating new holdings, these bodies communicate with the owner of such an estate with a view to entering into negotiations with him for the purchase of the same, whether he will at the commencement of the next session of Parliament lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the number of representations made, the names of landlords interested, the number of years purchase asked by each landlord, the number offered by the Estates Commissioners or the Congested Districts Board, and the number of cases where the intervention of these bodies will have resulted in the purchase of the estates and the consequent enlargement of the tenants' holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Returns have been laid on the Table showing very fully the operations of the Commissioners and the Congested Districts Board under the Act of 1903. These will be followed by further information to a later date, which will be published with the Annual Reports of the Commissioners and the

Board, but I cannot undertake to say that the Reports will contain Returns in the form specified in the Question.

Overcrowding on the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on several occasions the accommodation on the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway has been so limited that not only have the ordinary carriages been overcrowded, but sometimes from twenty to thirty persons have been forced to stand in the guard's van during the journey; and, if so, whether he will see that in future this company will make arrangements for a sufficient supply of carriages to convey the passengers over this line.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) My attention has not previously been called to this matter, and it is not one over which the Board of Trade has any statutory control. If, however, the hon. Member will furnish me with details of the complaint, I shall be happy to communicate with the Midland Great Western Railway Company thereon, and will acquaint him with the result.

Sale of Lord Clanmorris's Estate—Surrender of Grazing Ranches.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Lord Clanmorris has applied for an advance to the Estates Commissioners, in connection with the sale of his estate in the Ballinrobe Union, county Mayo; and, if so, whether, seeing that there are some grazing ranches on the estate suitable for the enlargment of holdings and the creation of new ones, the Estates Commissioners will refuse an advance unless these grazing ranches are given over to them in their present condition with a view to having them properly distributed amongst the other tenants and others, in accordance with the provisions of the Land Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No application for the sale of this estate has been made to the Commissioners.

Grazing Land on the Isadore Burke Estate.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have handed over any of the grazing lands on the Isadore Burke Estate, in the Claremorris Union, county Mayo, to any tenant on that or a neighbouring estate; and, if so, what is the name of such tenant, the extent of the holding he has received from the Board, and the extent of the holding he occupied before, if any; and whether, in view of the fact that there are a number of evicted tenants in that district, the Congested Districts Board will instal such evicted tenants in the new holdings which have been created on that estate, and refuse to consider the applications of all others until such time as they are provided for.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I must ask for a postponement of this Question for a day or two to enable inquiries to be made.

Army Reorganisation Scheme.

SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his promised statement respecting the Army Reorganisation Scheme will be in the hands of Members before the Army Debate on Monday next.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The statement which I promised the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, and that which I promised the hon. Member for East Perth, will be sent to the Vote Office this afternoon. A summary of my speech of 14th July was presented to Parliament on 15th July.

Extension of the National Portrait Gallery.

DR. FARQUHARSON: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is his intention to take action on the lines of the Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery who have called attention once more to the congested state of the gallery, and have said that the time is at hand when the question of extending the National Portrait Gallery must be seriously considered.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I find on inquiry that the possibility of extending the National Portrait Gallery on the West is being considered by the Departments concerned.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Visit of British Warships to Lerwick.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the visit of the German fleet (thirty-two ships) to Lerwick; and if he will consider the advisability of arranging for a visit of the British northern fleet, or part thereof.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The Answer to the first part of the Question is yes. With regard to the latter part, some of His Majesty's ships will visit Lerwick about the end of August.

The Judge Advocate-General.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Government propose to make any, and what, alterations in the position and duties of the Judge Advocate-General and of his Department, and when such alterations are to take effect; and whether their proposed alterations meet with the approval of the present holder of the office; and by whom are the legal duties in respect to Courts-martial discharged by the late Sir John Scott now performed.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): The position and duties of the Judge Advocate-General and his Department are still under consideration. The duties discharged by the late Sir John Scott are now performed by Mr. E. Bonus.

Ill-treatment of Boma Natives—Case of M. de Tiège.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has received from the Acting Consul at Boma a copy of the judgment of the Boma Court in the case of M. de Tiège, who was condemned on 24th June last to fifteen years imprisonment for atrocities committed upon the natives, he having succeeded in escaping while the trial was in progress; and, if no such copy has been received, will His Majesty's Government endeavour to secure one.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): His Majesty's Government have not received a copy of the judgment referred to, but the Acting Consul at Boma will be instructed by telegraph to furnish one.

Soudan Civil Service.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that Lord Cromer's last Annual Report shows that entrance to the Egyptian and Soudanese Civil Services is to be obtained by a system of selection rather than competitive examination; and will he state whether there is any reason why these appointments should not be subject to open competitive examination, similar to that which prevails in the case of the British Civil Service and the Civil Service of India.

EARL PERCY: The regulations for entrance into the Egyptian and Soudanese Civil Services primarily concern the Governments of Egypt and the Soudan, and His Majesty's Government see no reason to interfere with the arrangements set forth in Lord Cromer's Report.

Crete—Dr. Januaris' Case.

CAPTAIN ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for what offence Dr. Januaris is now in confinement in Crete; and what is the nature of the sentence to which he has been condemned.

EARL PERCY: Mr. Januaris was sentenced to two years imprisonment by the Cretan Court of First Instance on the charge of insulting the person of the High

Commissioner and conspiring against the Government. The sentence was subsequently confirmed by the Court of Appeal.

CAPTAIN ELLICE: Will the Government take steps to get some of the sentence remitted?

EARL PERCY: I do not think it is a question in which the Government can properly interfere.

CAPTAIN ELLICE: But the High Commissioner is appointed by the Government.

Old Horses as Human Food.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will direct inquiries to be made by the British Consuls, or some other reliable authority, in Holland, Belgium, and Germany, concerning the number of old and slaughtered horses, or horses unfit for work, that are periodically exported from this country, with a view of ascertaining for what purpose their carcases are used, and whether their flesh is made into condiments of various kinds, returned to this country, and sold as articles of food.

EARL PERCY: As regards the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, I will inquire whether the statistics could not be obtained through the Government Department here. As regards the last paragraph, there is no objection to instructing His Majesty's representatives abroad to ask for the information which the hon. Member desires.

MR. CREMER: Will the noble Lord give instructions that it shall be done?

EARL PERCY: Yes, Sir.

The Near East.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Austrian and German Governments have increased the number of their officers appointed to supervise the *gendarmerie* in Macedonia, and whether His Majesty's Government propose to take any similar measures.

EARL PERCY: Yes, Sir. An intimation has just reached us that the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Ambassadors have asked for an increase in the number of their officers employed in reorganising the Macedonian *gendarmerie*. His Majesty's Government consider that they have a right to demand equality with the other Powers in regard to any such increase, but the number of officers required for each district must, of course, be governed by the circumstances and extent of its area. His Majesty's Government are anxious that no unnecessary burdens should be imposed upon Turkey; and if an all-round increase of the European staff be decided upon it may possibly be found more economical and useful to employ any surplus officers who are not required in the districts already comprised in the *gendarmerie* scheme either in supervising a gradual extension of the scheme to other areas not yet included, or in affording assistance to the Turkish authorities in other departments of the administration.

MR. BRYCE: In that case will regard be had to the fact of the circumstances of Adrianople.

EARL PERCY: I have no doubt that fact will be taken into consideration.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Can the Under-Secretary give the House any information as to the arrival by Russia and Austria at a perfect agreement with reference to all the territories south of the Balkans.

EARL PERCY: I should like to have notice of that Question.

Venezuelan Tariffs.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the negotiations between His Majesty's Government and the Government of Venezuela with reference to the 30 per cent. differential surtax on importations from the West Indian Colonies into Venezuela have yet been concluded; if so, with what result; and whether he can now lay Papers upon the Table.

EARL PERCY: The question of the differential surtax is still the subject of negotiation at Caracas and no Papers can at present be laid.

Bank of Ireland and the County Treasury.

Captain DONELAN (Cork County, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the exact terms of the arrangement come to between the Treasury officials and the Bank of Ireland before the passing of the Bank Act of 1892 (55 and 56 Vic. c. 48), under which, as a complement to that Act, the Bank of Ireland is enabled to hold for a period and to use, without payment of interest, all Government balances whether arising out of any Act of Parliament then in force or out of any other Act to be subsequently passed over the course of the twenty years during which the aforementioned Bank Act was to run; whether he will give a reference to any section of the Bank Act of 1892 covering such a Treasury arrangement or in any way bearing upon the same; whether he will also lay upon the Table of the House the terms of any arrangement made with the Provincial Bank of Ireland under which that bank collects, retains for a period without interest, and then remits to the Bank of Ireland all Inland Revenue moneys collected outside a radius of fifty miles from the city of Dublin; whether that arrangement is covered by any Act of Parliament; and whether he intends to allow this monopoly to be continued, instead of allowing the other joint stock banks to transact the business in question in turn as is the practice in Scotland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): I informed the hon. and gallant Gentleman, in reply to his Question on the 12th of May last,† that the arrangement by which the Government accounts in Dublin are kept by the Bank of Ireland is not embodied in any specific agreement. The Bank Act, 1892, reduced the rate of interest payable to the Bank of Ireland on the Government debt to the bank, and it reduced the remuneration payable to the bank for management of the National Debt. These reductions were arrived at after an inquiry which took account of the advantage derived by the bank from the custody of the Government balances; and it would be unfair to disturb those arrangements during the period (to 1912) for which the reduced rates of interest and remuneration were prescribed by the Act. I gave full particulars of the arrangement in force with the Provincial Bank of Ireland in reply to the hon. Member for North-East Cork, on the 8th of June.‡ I then said that I was not satisfied that the arrangement was the best possible, and I am having the subject inquired into.

Captain DONELAN: But why not adopt in Ireland the system which obtains in England and Scotland?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Because the connection between the Government and the bank is not the same.

Captain DONELAN: The present arrangement inflicts a gross injustice on the other Irish joint stock banks.

Spirit Permits.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that spirits which have passed out of bond are still under the control of the Excise authorities, inasmuch as particulars of all spirits received by a trader are required by the Excise to be entered in a specially prepared Excise stock book which is periodically inspected; and, in view of the fact that all quantities of spirits over two gallons must be accompanied by a permit, issued and controlled by the Excise authorities, and which contains a description of the goods, he will see that henceforth the officials will not permit spirits blended with patent spirit as P. B. Spirit, meaning Plain British Spirit, or brandy so blended as F. B., meaning Foreign Brandy.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Permits used by the Excise are required only for spirits moved under bond or out of bond. For the removal of duty-paid spirits, only certificates are required, and these are issued, not by the Excise, but by the trader. They afford the Excise no opportunity for exercising any control over the character and quality of the spirits removed.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 1158.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 1051.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.) was understood to ask whether a permit was not an official document, seeing that no spirits could be sent out without one?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That is the Question I have answered.

Rent Allowances to Metropolitan Police.

*MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the fact that the recent grant of rent-aid to constables, attached to police stations beyond the Metropolitan boroughs, was accompanied by conditions which deprive certain men of 1s. 6d. per week, if they are discovered to be paying less than 6s. a week for house rent, so that men paying 6s. and over obtain the 1s. 6d., whilst men paying say 5s. 10d. are deprived of the allowance; whether he will consider the advisability of discontinuing his sanction to this and other inequalities in the payment of the Metropolitan Police.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The allowance to which the hon. Member refers is intended to assist those members of the Metropolitan Police Force who have necessarily to pay rents so high in amount as to impose an undue strain on their income. It is obvious that if a grant is made in aid of rent, the rents actually paid by the men must be taken into consideration; and, after careful and prolonged inquiry, I came to the conclusion that when a constable pays for rent less than 6s. a week, which is about one-fifth of the average pay of his rank, he does not need such assistance. The present conditions of rent-aid were laid down by me in March last; they are by no means wanting in liberality; and I see no reason for altering them.

*MR. SLACK: Am I to understand from the Home Secretary that it is necessary for a man whose rent is 5s. 10d. a week to pay 2d. a week more in rent in order to obtain the 1s. 6d.?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The line must be drawn somewhere, whenever you make a rule. This concession was granted after careful consideration, and was received with universal approval by the force.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Could not the arrangement be readjusted so that an allowance not exceeding 1s. 6d. should be made to every constable?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have considered the point, and must decline to consider it again this year.

Holloway Gaol—Cutting of Female Prisoners' Hair while under Remand.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Elizabeth Hudson, aged 20, while under remand, from 14th July to 21st July at Holloway Gaol, from Tottenham Police Court, on a charge of suspected stealing, which charge was the first brought against her and was summarily dismissed by the magistrates on 21st July; and Sarah Ann Pratt, aged seventeen, while under remand, from 14th July to 21st July at Holloway Goal, from Tottenham Police Court, on a charge of suspected stealing, from which charge she was released by the magistrates upon a surety of 20s. being given for her good behaviour, had their hair cut off short by the prison authorities; and, if so, will he say whether it is the usual custom so to treat young female prisoners under remand.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: My attention has been called to the case of the two women mentioned in the Question. I find that their hair was cut in accordance with the prison rule which requires prisoners under remand to have their hair cut when this is necessary on account of dirt or vermin. The necessity of such a rule is obvious in the interest of the cleanliness of the prison and for the protection of other prisoners; but it is not the custom to cut the hair of prisoners under remand. It is done only on medical grounds when the hair is actually verminous, and when milder methods of treatment are impracticable.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: May I ask whether, as a matter of fact, the hair of these women was cut before they were submitted to the inspection of the medical officer?

***Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS**: I am making inquiries on that point.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that the report of the medical officer is available for Members of this House?

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Would it not be possible for the authorities, in cases like this, to wash the hair instead of cutting it?

***Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS**: I have said that I will make further inquiries, and all the information I can get shall be communicated to the House.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: But when will the information be available? We are near the end of the session; and I am anxious to have this matter cleared up before we separate.

***Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS**: There will be no avoidable delay, but that is all I can say at present.

The Fiscal Question—Preferential Tariffs and Retaliation.

Mr. EMMOTT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will have prepared and present to Parliament a Report on the probable effect of preferential tariffs on the trade of the United Kingdom, applying to the United Kingdom criteria similar to those employed with reference to India in Cd. 1931 (1904).

Mr. EMMOTT: I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will present to Parliament a statement of the probable effect on the trade of the United Kingdom of the proposals for retaliation explained by the Prime Minister, having especial regard to those countries which impose the highest tariffs on goods imported by them from this country.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): I do not think it right that a Government Department should be called upon to publish official Reports such as are asked for in these Questions, in which speculative conjecture and personal opinions must necessarily play so large a part.

The Telegraph Vote and the Bradford Wages Committee's Report.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state the date upon which the Telegraph Vote will be taken; and if he will announce beforehand his decision as to the recommendations as to the Bradford Wages Committee.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Will the hon. Member kindly put the first part of his Question to the Prime Minister on Monday. I hope to make a statement on the Vote, not before, with regard to the Report of the Committee on Post Office Wages. I have no doubt an opportunity will be given for a discussion on the Vote.

"Season Telegraphists."

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether authority has been given for the despatch of unestablished telegraph operators from one office to another in connection with events entailing a temporary increase of work; and, if so, whether such officers are entitled to subsistence allowances on the scale laid down in the rule to head postmasters, and, if not, will he state what allowances have been fixed, and what is the date of the authorisation.

Lord STANLEY: I presume the hon. Member refers to assistants who are employed at certain offices to provide for temporary increase of work during the season months. In such cases the rate of pay is fixed so as to provide suitable remuneration, and no special allowances for subsistence are, as a rule, given.

Instruction in Domestic Economy for Girls.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that the Committee on Physical Deterioration, in their Report just issued, express the opinion that instruction in cookery, hygiene, and domestic economy should as far as possible be made compulsory on the elder girls at school; and will he consider the expediency of adopting this recommendation.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The various recommendations of the Committee on Physical Deterioration will certainly receive the careful consideration of the Board. The question of instruction in cookery, hygiene, and domestic economy is one which has lately been especially investigated by the Board, and is now receiving their most careful attention.

Ventilation of the House of Commons.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he will state whether the inlet fan ordered for the ventilation of the House of Commons is a cased pressure fan and of a type used for mine ventilation, what is its size and capacity, and is it guaranteed to be noiseless in the working; and will he explain the structural difficulties which have arisen in connection with the adoption and application of an extraction fan?

LORD BALCARRES: The type of fan selected for the inlet ventilation of the House of Commons is of the cased blower type, which is largely adopted for mine ventilation. The fan and motor are guaranteed to work without noise. The structural difficulties connected with the extraction concern building matters only. No application to tender for the extraction fan will be refused.

MR. WEIR pressed for further information as to the size of the fan, and was asked to put the Question down.

Bangor (County Down) Harbour.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, if the estimates for a harbour for the Bangor fishermen can be cut down to £5,000, he will consent to recommend a grant for that amount.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Department of Agriculture offered to contribute one-fourth of the expenditure on the improvement of the harbour, originally estimated to cost £10,000. The Department is not prepared to contribute the entire cost, if reduced to £5,000.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I hope the right hon. Gentleman will bear in mind that Bangor is a place much used by the Navy.

Victor de l'Herault's Estate.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps does the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland intend to take with reference to the sums, with interest and accumulations thereon, now representing the sums of £3,183 7s. 3d. India Stock, and £1,411 5s. 6d. cash for interest thereon, paid to the Crown in March, 1879, by Madame de l'Herault, as widow and administratrix of Victor Lucy de l'Herault, who died intestate in November, 1869, without next-of-kin, such sums being a moiety of the personal estate of her said husband; and whether, having regard to the fact that now, after the lapse of thirty-five years, notwithstanding numerous and expensive inquiries by the Crown, no next-of-kin of the said Victor Lucy de l'Herault have been discovered; that in July, 1880, the Crown restored to the widow leasehold and freehold property owned by M. de l'Herault; that in January, 1900, the Attorney-General for Ireland, pending further inquiries with reference to the ascertainment of next-of-kin, ordered the dividends on the fund in hand to be paid to Madame de l'Herault, who, however, died in the July following, bequeathing the fund, if restored by the Crown, among certain of her blood relations in indigent circumstances; and that the said fund consisted of money which originally belonged in large measure to Madame de l'Herault herself, the Crown will consider the propriety of releasing this fund to Mr. Cullen, the legal personal representative of Madame de l'Herault, who will carry out the tenets of her will and give the guarantee of the Loan Guarantee Society against any claim by any of the next-of-kin, if such there be, of M. de l'Herault.

MR. WYNDHAM: When this case was last before the Attorney-General he gave such directions as he thought would meet the necessities of the case, but in view of the matters stated in the Question I will again refer the case to him for further consideration.

Cusack Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state when the application for a request under the seventh Section of the Land Act, 1903, is likely to be made by the Estates Commissioners to Mr. Justice Ross in the case of the Cusack Estate, county Longford.

MR. WYNDHAM: The request was issued on the 18th of June.

Thompson Estate—North Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state what action the Estates Commissioners intend taking in the case of the Thompson (Clonfin) Estate in North Longford.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application has been made to the Commissioners for the sale of this estate.

Irish Land Act Administration.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners can give the number of proposed sales under the Irish Land Act, 1903, in which originating notices have been served, and which have been postponed or fallen through in consequence of the judicial decision that the bonus under Section 48 is not payable to the tenant for life.

MR. WYNDHAM: No estimate can be given of the very large number of cases in which a tenant for life refrains from selling until the intentions of Parliament in this matter are relieved from doubt.

Trench's Estate, Tipperary.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the estate of Mr. B B. Trench, Redwood, Tipperary, is about being sold to the tenants; is he aware that a Mrs. Kennedy, of Pluverhill, and her family were evicted off the property twelve years ago; and that her farm has been taken by the brother and agent of the landlord; and, if so, can he state what provision is about to be made for the reinstatement of the evicted tenant in this case, in view of the fact that Mrs. Kennedy is the only evicted tenant on the property.

MR. WYNDHAM: An application has been received from the evicted tenant and will be considered. The estate has not yet been brought before the Commissioners for sale.

Beresford Estate, County Waterford.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that application has been made to the Estates Commissioners for the sale of the estate of Mr. John G. Beresford, Woodhouse, Stradbally, county Waterford, and for the reinstatement by George Crowley, Catherine Barry, Garrett Barry, and other tenants evicted from this estate, he can say whether the Estates Commissioners expect to be able to bring about the reinstatement of these tenants in their former holdings or procure other farms for them.

MR. WYNDHAM: No proceedings are pending before the Commissioners in respect to this estate. Any applications made by the evicted tenants will be duly considered.

MR. POWER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners will inquire if some of the lands from which tenants have been evicted on the Beresford Estate are now in the hands of the landlord, Mr. John G. Beresford, Woodhouse, Stradbally, county Waterford, who is selling his estate through the Estate Commissioners; and, if so, will the Estates Commissioners bear the circumstances in mind when considering the application of evicted tenants on this estate for reinstatement.

MR. WYNDHAM: No proceedings for the sale of this estate are pending before the Estates Commissioners.

Belfast Anglers and Ballynahinch River.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that the persons who, in company with three water bailiffs, were concerned in the illegal netting of Ballynahinch River on 6th June last, were not riparian owners, but members of the Belfast Anglers' Association; that the netting was across the river, with a drag net with mesh small enough to stop all but the smallest fry; and, if so whether, in view of the fact that this action was watched by the police, he will direct a prosecution.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department understands that the Belfast Anglers' Association claim to have the right of netting in these waters. In view of the divergence of opinion in the matter, with respect to which the Department is advised that it is not competent to express an opinion, it is open to any person who feels aggrieved by the action of the Association to have recourse to a legal tribunal. The Department does not propose to institute proceedings.

North Dublin Guardians—Case of John Morris.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the board of guardians of the North Dublin Union have handed over John Morris, aged 13, the son of Protestant parents, to his sister, who is a Roman Catholic, in opposition to the wishes of the boy's father, as expressed in his will, by which he appointed the Rev. Mr. Mease, Rector of Castleknock, guardian of the child and his religion; and that the Rev. Mr. Mease's application to the board of guardians to have the boy handed over to him, in order that he might place him, at his own expense, at the Meath Industrial School, was refused; and, if so, will he state what steps he will take to have the boy handed over to his lawful guardian and to have him brought up a Protestant.

MR. WYNDHAM: The guardians claim that they were entitled to take the course they took under the 8th Section of the 25 and 26 Vict. c. 83. Whether they were entitled so to do after they had become aware of the claim of the testamentary guardian, Mr. Mease, and his offer to have the boy maintained at his own expense, is a point of law which the Local Government Board or the Executive have no power to decide. Mr. Mease must seek such redress as he may be entitled to in a Court of law.

Dungannon School.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what is the cause of the delay in proceeding with the erection of the new school in Dungannon, for which a free site has been granted, and which has been approved by the Board of Works, and for which a scheme has been approved by the Commissioners of Education; and will he state when will the revised plans and estimates, for which the persons interested in this school have been waiting for eighteen months, be ready.

MR. WYNDHAM: In this case the Commissioners provisionally sanctioned a grant for a new school-house under the existing regulations. The applicant has since elected, however, to postpone the erection of a school-house pending a decision on the question of the revision of the plans and estimates.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: May I remind the right hon. Gentleman that this has been delayed eighteen months?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is a matter for the Treasury and not for me.

Cookstown Disturbances.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the rev. Father M'Brien, Washing Bay, and a party of friends, were insulted and threatened by an Orange crowd when driving to Cookstown on Sunday last; that, notwithstanding the fact that this circumstance was duly reported to the police, no notice was taken of it, with the result that on their return journey Father M'Brien and his friends were hooted and stoned; and, if so, will he explain why the police did not afford the rev. Father M'Brien any protection, and will the ringleaders of his assailants be prosecuted.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am making further inquiries in this matter and will thank the hon. Member to defer the Question until Monday next.

Earl Fitzwilliam's Tenants.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many of the tenants of Earl Fitzwilliam have been served with notices of ejectment within the last three months for arrears of rent; and whether he can state how many of these tenants have, since the receipt of ejectment notices, consented to accept the landlord's terms of purchase.

MR. WYNDHAM: No ejectment notices were served on this estate within the period stated.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Six months ago the right hon. Gentleman told me a certain number of ejectment notices had been issued by Lord Fitzwilliam.

Fox Estate, King's County.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners will delay their sanction of the agreements for sale on the Fox Estate, Ballymacrossin, King's County, pending the settlement of the claims of an evicted tenant, Miss Maria Masterson, particulars of whose case have already been lodged with the Commissioners; whether he will use any influence within his power against any advance being sanctioned in the case of the tenant Langford, now in possession of Miss Maria Masterson's farm, until provision is made for her as an evicted tenant; and whether he can communicate the result of the recent inspection of the estate of Major Fox, and state whether the inspector's report contains any suggestion for the reinstatement of Miss Masterson or the acquisition of any holding for her elsewhere.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have nothing to add to my reply to the similar Question by the hon. Member for Queen's County of the 18th July.†

Lansdowne Estate, Queen's County.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the evicted tenants and their representatives upon the Lansdowne Estate, Queen's County, have applied to the Estates Commissioners asking to be reinstated in their holdings, and in view of the area of the evicted farms untenanted upon this estate, he will state what course the Estates Commissioners propose taking in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: Applications have been received from forty-one evicted tenants on this estate. The Commissioners understand that the owner is considering the question of selling to them his Queen's County estate. Should he propose to do so, the Commissioners will carefully consider the applications of the evicted tenants.

Game Licences in Ireland—Colehill Gamekeeper's Conduct.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the action of a gamekeeper, named Robert Lloyd, stationed at Colehill, county Longford, who on two occasions recently stopped Dr. Bonus and his brother, a Trinity College student, on the public road, demanding their licences, and threatening prosecutions if they refused to show same; whether he is aware that on 1st August, this gamekeeper treated Mr. T. J. Byrne, of Tenelick, in like manner; and, if so, will he, in the interest of the peace of the district, caution this person to desist from such conduct.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 279.

MR. WYNDHAM: If Dr. Bonus and his brother were found by the gamekeeper using any dog, gun, net or other engine for the destruction of game, it would be lawful for the gamekeeper, he himself having and producing his game certificate, to demand the production of their certificates under the 8th Section of the 5 & 6 Vict. c. 81; but if the gamekeeper did not find them doing any of these things, bnt merely found them using or carrying a gun, he was not justified in demanding the production of their gun licences—that privilege being confined under the 9th Section of the Gun Licence Act of 1870, to Officers of Inland Revenue or the Constabulary.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: The point is that this demand was made on a public road? Cannot the right hon. Gentleman restrain this man?

MR. WYNDHAM: If a man asks an unwarranted question on the high road it is for the aggrieved person to take what steps he chooses.

Glanquin Extra Police Force.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland will he say why the authorities have thought it necessary to station an extra police force in Glanquin Cordfair, county Clare; whether he is aware that the police have acted as herdsmen on the Glanquin farm, and have assisted in cutting and saving hay there; and, if so, has their action received his sanction; and will he state why the police have searched the houses of Nationalists for arms, and on what information have they acted in so doing.

MR. WYNDHAM: A police hut is about to be erected in this locality for the better preservation of the public peace. The police have not acted as herdsmen, nor have they assisted in cutting or saving hay. Two houses in the vicinity were searched for arms with the consent of the occupants in each case.

North Kerry Rod Anglers and the Close Season.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that dissatisfaction exists throughout North Kerry, owing to the fact that rod anglers, licensed or otherwise, are not permitted to fish until the 1st day of May in each year, and that at a public meeting held at Listowel a short time since a resolution was passed requesting the Government to take such action as may be necessary to allow rod anglers to fish at an earlier period of the year than the 1st day of May; and, if so, whether, owing to the interest felt in this question, the request of the people will be acceded to without cost to the locality.

MR. WYNDHAM: Representations to this effect have been made to the Department. In the present state of the law, however, it is unable to give effect to them.

MR. FLAVIN: Do I understand the Department do not consider it necessary to hold an inquiry?

MR. WYNDHAM: Nothing can be done until the law is changed.

Cashen (Kerry) Salmon Fishery.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Kerry County Council at their meeting on the 28th ultimo passed a resolution requesting the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries to hold a local inquiry as to the cause of the practical extinction of the salmon fishery at the Cashen (N. Kerry); and whether, owing to the fact that a number of fishermen are, or will be, thrown out of employment, the Board will take immediate steps by way of a local inquiry.

MR. WYNDHAM: The resolution has not yet been communicated to the Department.

Labourers Cottages Grant Distribution.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Lords Justices to distribute the unissued balances of Labourers Cottages Grant of 1890, to the unions which have put the Labourers Acts in force; and, if so, whether he can state when the unissued balances will be so distributed.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The question of the allocation of the unissued balances of this grant would be a proper matter for consideration in the event of legislation at any future time dealing with labourers' cottages.

Uneconomic Holdings at Athenry.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there are several uneconomic holdings on the property of Clarke minors, at Graig Abbey, Athenry; that Mr. O'Malley, who lives 80 miles away from the place, is endeavouring to purchase 250 acres of grass land on the estate; and whether, in view of the fact that this grass farm adjoins the uneconomic holdings, will he take steps to secure the grass land for distribution amongst the tenants in the neighbourhood who require it.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This property, which is solvent, is under the administration of the Land Judge. Mr. O'Malley held the lands referred to under a lease from the Court, and the Land Judge has approved of their sale to him.

Irish Department of Agriculture, Veterinary Department—Clerks' Grievances.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an attempt has been made by a high official to intimidate the Catholics employed in the Veterinary Branch of the Department of Agriculture on account of certain inquiries made in this House; and, if so, what steps he proposes taking to prevent so serious a breach of the constitutional privileges of Parliament.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The reply to this Question is in the negative. What occurred was this. The secretary to the Department recently received from four clerks attached to the Veterinary Branch a communication offensive in tone, which repeated several of the misstatements of fact and unfounded insinuations that have been made the subject of public comment. He informed these officials that while the Department was always willing to receive representations from the staff of a proper and respectful character, and had shown much solicitude on behalf of the officials in question, the Department could not consider a document of the kind, and would feel compelled to take serious notice of a persistence in the methods which the document illustrated. The matter is one affecting the internal discipline of the Department, with which it is competent to deal.

Bangor (Ireland) Post Office.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, considering the growing population of Bangor and the need for increased post office accommodation repeatedly expressed by the urban council, he will consent to reconsider his decision as to providing a new post office.

Lord STANLEY: I regret that I am unable to reconsider this question at present, but I will have the matter watched, and will take any further action which I think circumstances may require. If the hon. Member can give me any information I shall be glad to receive it.

The Late Mrs. Helen Blake's Estate.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the present position of the funds of the estate of the late Mrs Helen Blake, née Sheridan, who died in London in the year 1871 possessed of funds and other securities valued for nearly half a million of pounds sterling; whether it is proposed to sequestrate this sum for Treasury purposes; whether any inquiries have been made for next of kin; will such inquiries be made before any attempt is made to sequestrate the estate; and, if so, will evidence by tradition be received.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): The Crown's title to the real estate of the deceased was found by Special Commission of Escheat. Administration of the personal estate was granted to the Solicitor to the Treasury, and by an Order of Court dated 23rd June, 1883, it was declared that the Crown was entitled to the residue of the estate. The usual inquiries were made for the next of kin and heir-at-law to the deceased. It is not proposed to make further inquiries of this character or to initiate any further proceedings.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been called to the case of the estate of the late Mrs. Helen Blake, of London, who died intestate in 1871; whether any application has been submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown on the part of relatives and friends of the late Mrs. Blake, named Sheridan, residing in county Longford; and whether, having regard to the fact that actual evidence of birth by extract from register is almost impossible of production in this case, he would be prepared to advise the Crown to issue a Commission to take evidence of tradition in this case.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): Two Petitions of Right were presented in 1892 with reference to the estate of Mrs. Helen Blake, who died in 1876; both were dismissed for want of prosecution. I understand that other claims have been alleged. It is practicable to issue a Commission as suggested in the Question.

Edgeworthstown Loan Fund Society Frauds.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether, in view of the frauds perpetrated by officials of the Loan Fund Society of Edgeworthstown, he can indicate what relief can be obtained by debenture-holders who have lost their savings, owing to the failure on the part of the Central Board to properly supervise the work of the local officials.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The only fraud committed in connection with this society, of which the Loan Fund Board have knowledge, was that committed by a late clerk, named James Flower. In reply to the remainder of the Question, I have nothing to add to the Answer given by my right hon. friend to the hon. Member's previous Question of the 26th July.†

Irish Royal Canal.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will take steps to induce the Midland Great Western Railway Company of Ireland, as owners of the Royal Canal, to have it properly dredged, as owing to the state of the waterway boats can only convey half loads; whether he is aware that the steam dredger which the Board of Trade ordered the Canal Company to provide has not been used on the canal for the past two years; and whether he will at once direct the company to proceed with the cleaning and dredging.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The periodical reports made by the Midland Great Western Railway Company to the Board of Works show that dredging has been carried out on the Royal Canal regularly and continuously for some time past. During the three months ended 30th June last, thirty-five miles of the canal was cleansed and cleared of weeds. The engineer of the Board of Works will inspect the canal at an early date.

South African Republic—Commandeered Specie.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether an opportunity will be given before the close of the present session to discuss the claim against the Government in the matter of the specie commandeered by the Government of the late South African Republic from British banks.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that, as he will readily understand, it is not easy, indeed I may say it is not possible, to find opportunities in the remainder of the session for discussions outside the actual programme of necessary business. I may also remind him that there has been a very large correspondence on this subject between the Government and the persons interested, and the matter has been settled on general principles to the best of our ability.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman submit the matter to arbitration?

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 1214.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should think not; but if my hon. friend will give notice I will consider the matter.

Flogging in the Navy.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury why the flogging of men with the cat-o'-nine-tails, and of boys and youths under eighteen with birches, weighing nine ounces, and canes, is still allowable and practised in the Navy, although the system has been long abolished in the Army; and whether any steps will be taken for the abolition of flogging in the senior branch of the King's service.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there was no flogging of men in the Navy, and it was not proposed to abolish the birching and caning of boys. There was consequently no intention to take any such steps as were suggested by the hon. Member.

St. Katherine's Hospital, Regent's Park.

MR. CREMER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Tunbridge Division of Kent, as a Charity Commissioner, whether any, and, if any, what reforms have been made in the application and administration of the endowments of St. Katherine's Hospital in the Regent's Park, or whether what the Charity Commissioner in 1893 in this House described as a scandal still exists; whether £6,402 is annually expended upon salaries and management; £561 upon education; and £190 upon gifts; whether the master still receives a salary of £1,200; how many sermons he preaches during the year; and what are the other duties connected with his office; whether there are three brothers and three sisters, each of them receiving £300 per annum, besides being provided with a residence; what are the duties performed by the brothers and sisters; how many inquiries have at different times been instituted into this endowment, and what changes have resulted from such inquiries; and whether he will cause to be laid upon the Table of the House a copy of the reforms which Mr. Skirrow, on behalf of the Charity Commissioners, proposed several years ago, and also a statement of the income and expenditure of the hospital during the year ending 31st December last.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) was not in his place to answer.

MR. CREMER asked the Prime Minister whether he would afford the House an opportunity of discussing the Vote for the Charity Commission, which had not been discussed in the House of Commons for three years. In the Question he had on the Paper grave representations were made, on the authority of a former member of the Charity Commission, to the effect that the "charity" named was a scandal.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is not entitled to make a speech.

MR. CREMER: I will only ask, then, whether, considering the importance of the Vote, the Prime Minister will, before the end of the session, give the House an opportunity of giving it some consideration, however scanty.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Being unacquainted with the particular case, I can form no estimate of its importance, but if possible, within the somewhat narrow limit of time left, I shall be glad to give the opportunity asked for, but it is impossible for me to give any pledge on the subject.

Representative Government in the Transvaal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether there is any, and, if so, what, instance during the last seventy years of the granting of representative or responsible government to any colony or dependency in the British Empire otherwise than by statute establishing the new colonial constitution, as in the case of Canada, the various Australian Colonies, and Cape Colony; and whether the usual practice will be followed in the promised establishment of representative and elective institutions in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman has in his Question confused two different cases. There is the case of complete self-government; and the hon. Gentleman is right in supposing that complete self-government has never been given to any colony without action by Parliament. But smaller changes, with which alone we propose to deal in the immediate future, have not been, according to precedent, dealt with in this way, and we do not propose to vary the practice.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it not the case that representative government, as distinct from responsible government, has always been given by statute?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The addition of elected members is constantly done by Order in Council.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Has it been done in any case except the West Indies, which are under completely different circumstances?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I have stated the precedent accurately. If the hon. Gentleman wants further information he must put a Question on the Paper.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BRYCE asked the Prime Minister whether he would arrange the Order Paper for the evening sitting so as to take the Shop Hours Bill first. He also suggested that as there appeared on the Orders a number of measures which the Government had announced their intention to drop it would be as well to clear them off.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR agreed that it would be as well to do so. With regard to the Shop Hours Bill he sympathised with the desire to see it passed, but said other measures must be proceeded with first. He thought the best plan would be to put the Bills down in the following order: Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bills, Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Public Works Loans Bill, Indian Councils Bill, and Isle of Man Customs Bill. For reasons already explained it was desirable to get the Post Office Sites Bill as soon as possible.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): And is it proposed to take the Shop Hours Bill after those five? Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give it a better place?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I wish I had more good places at my disposal. But if there is a real desire to pass the Bill surely there should be no difficulty. I hope the discussion on the earlier Orders will not take long.

Mr. WHITLEY: There is a danger of its not getting through if it is kept so long on the list.

Mr. LOUGH: Why not let it change places with the Bishoprics Bill?

NEW BILL.

JUVENILE SMOKING BILL.

"To provide for the Prevention of Juvenile Smoking," presented by Mr. Rigg; supported by Colonel Bain, Mr. Allen, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Lambert; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 3 295.]

SUPPLY [20th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

Class II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £104,094, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department and Subordinate Offices."

***Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean)** moved a reduction of the Vote by £100 on account of the present understaffed condition of the women's department for the work it had to do in connection with the Factory and Workshop Acts. A branch of the service which was most useful to the State was, the right hon. Baronet said, at the present moment insufficiently staffed for the work it had to do, and that was made very clear in the Report which had just been laid by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. The greatest of industrial sufferings in this country were probably those which were to be found among the very lowly paid women workers. The great trades unions which had been formed were generally able to affect the wages of the male workers, but undoubtedly there was much underpayment and sweating in the case of female labour, and a large amount of industrial suffering could be very directly affected by the enforcement of the law through the medium of the Home Office, and by the inquiries which were made by the women's branch of the Department. In the Factories and Workshops Annual Report for 1903 the principal woman inspector stated that there were "Six women inspectors for 1,500,000 women and girls in factories and workshops," to which should be added "laundry workers and outworkers." In the ten years which had elapsed since the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife inaugurated this most valuable Department eight women inspectors had been appointed, of whom one was now detached for the Potteries on work which, although described as temporary, occupied the whole of her time, leaving only six effective for the general work, or seven if the principal inspector who discharged central duties at the Home Office was counted. The ill-effects of understaffing, effects which were increasing year by year, were clearly set forth in the Report. For three years complaints stood over on account of the shortness of the staff. The year before last the Report showed that "122 complaints had either to stand over . . . . or to be referred to another branch." Though the complaints had risen, the prosecutions had declined, and the women's department was, according to Miss Anderson, "greatly embarrassed in arranging for investigation." The present condition of the Department nullified the value which the House very properly attached to its work. There had once been most valuable inquiries conducted outside the actual work of the women's department. The investigation of complaints specially made by women's societies had had to be dropped in consequence of there being no lady inspectors available to undertake them. The value of these inquiries had been demonstrated in past years, and notably in the case of the fish-curing industry. Complaints from women workers had to be referred to the male branch for investigation. The Pimlico Army Clothing Department, for example, employed women. The case of Alice Wright recently attracted a great deal of attention, and the Home Office was asked by the War Office to send an inspector. The inspector sent was not a woman, although all those employed in these frightfully overcrowded and heated rooms were women. Again, the Department did not send a ventilation expert and that therefore could not be advanced as a reason for not sending a lady. It was not open to the Department to say that they sympathised with the demand for more women inspectors, but that they could not overcome the difficulty with the Treasury, because the fact was that the Treasury had permitted thirteen additional male inspectors to be appointed between April, 1902, and July, 1903, whereas no woman had been appointed.

Next there was the question of overtime in the fishcuring trade. When the Factory Acts of 1895 and 1901 were under consideration he opposed the special exemption on the ground that there would be great difficulty in distinguishing between legal and illegal overtime. In the report of the inspector dealing with Yarmouth and Lowestoft, it was stated—

> "Kippering — women splitting herrings. They all appeared very tired, and no wonder, seeing the number of hours each woman worked that week.—9th November, Monday, 6 a.m. to 12 p.m.; Tuesday, 10th, 6 a.m. to 11 p.m.; Wednesday, 11th, 6 a.m. to 11.30 p.m.; Thursday, 12th, 6 a.m. to 11.30 p.m.; Friday, 13th, 6 a.m. to 12.40 midnight; Saturday, 14th, 6 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.--total, 105 hours and ten minutes.'

Allowing, however, three hours off each day for meals, the total worked was 87 hours and ten minutes. This was not an isolated case. At 6 a.m. the women begin packing the kippers in wooden boxes, so that here the Committee had an illustration of the truth of the objection which had been raised in 1895, and 1901 that legal overtime invariably led to illegal overtime. Here the women were working factory hours on processes not subject to exemption, followed by long night hours under "the perishable exemption." On page 33 of the Report they had another instance of the unduly long hours in another trade at Southampton. They had cases where women were kept working from 8.30 a.m. to 11.45 p.m. He would like to draw the attention of the Committee to page 196 of the Report. There Miss Deane gave a most admirable statement on the whole subject. She referred to the fact that it was a dressmaking trade case, that this particular trade had recently been the subject of much comment in the Press and that it had been alleged that there had been much exaggeration. But what did Miss Deane say in her report—

> "Places in which a staff has been employed for months on three-quarter time only have been found employing girls for nights on end till eleven o'clock or even all night long. The number of complaints of illegal or excessive overtime have increased."

On page 237 they had a reference to a case which probably was the foundation of the correspondence on which the charge of exaggeration was based. It was also an illustration of the thesis contained in Mrs. Lyttelton's play of *Warp and Woof*. Miss Vines, in her report, stated—

> "At the prosecution the defendant put forward the defence that a lady in a high position was pressing for a dress to be finished. The magistrate described the defendant's conduct as almost inhuman, and said that it was almost incredible that she should have treated her workers in the way described, knowing, as she must have done, that the strain upon the young women, if continued, would tend to shorten their lives. It was the very worst case he had ever had before him, and he had never heard anything like it since the Factory Acts had been in operation."

In that case the woman had been employed for twenty-four consecutive hours. In the next case mentioned in the Report a girl was "discovered wandering insane." This brought him back to the point at which he started, viz., that alongside this startling state of things there was a decline in the total number of prosecutions by both branches of the Department: page viii. showed the decline in the total number of prosecutions; page 235 dealt with those in the Women's Department. It could not be alleged that that decline meant a decline in actual offences; the language used was quite contrary to that; it represented a decline in the efficiency of the Department compared with the amount of work there was for it to do.

Another important point calling for attention was the marked distinction between the penalties inflicted in certain districts by the local magistrates and those inflicted by the stipendaries. Hon. Members interested in the cotton districts knew very well that on account of the light penalties inflicted it was better to break the law than to keep it. On page 81 the inspector said—

> "I prosecuted a large firm of dressmakers in Grimsby after warning several times. The whole facts in the case, with the correspondence, were laid before the magistrates, who inflicted a penalty of 1s. and costs."

Again on page 97 they were told by the Sheffield inspector that the average penalty inflicted by the stipendiary magistrate was £1 5s., as compared with 2s. 11½d. inflicted by the ordinary magistrates. It was not very easy to suggest a remedy for this state of things, but the action taken a few years ago might be usefully repeated, and a circular couched in moderate and reasonable language might be sent round by the Home Secretary directing the attention of magistrates to the necessity of inflicting an adequate fine where a case was clearly proved.

Another example of slackness in the Home Office was the delay in extending the "particulars" principle to piece-work trades. He did not see why it should not be extended to all the piece-work trades in the country. Instead of wasting time—instead of wasting months and even years on inquiries into one small branch of a trade let them recognise the fact that this particular section was the charter of the rights of the people which protected them against being robbed of their wages, and let them have one general inquiry with a view to extending the section to all piece-work trades. He believed it was just as necessary as check-weighing was in the interests of the workers in the coal trade. On page 232 of the Report Miss Sadler dealt with the net-making trade and said—

> "The fact that few of the women could attend at the factories themselves to see the coils of twine weighed in and out led to deductions for short weight upon the return of the net which the worker had no means of disproving. The manufacturers acted upon my suggestion. The workers expressed their gratitude. The addition of the price had put shillings into their pocket. One or two manufacturers failed to carry out this plan."

But why should such a matter be left to persuasion? Why not extend the law?

Now he came to breaches of the Truck Act. In his opinion fresh legislation was necessary to meet these cases, and if that were so he would not be entitled to pursue the point. But he believed the Home Office held that the existing law was sufficient if only properly administered. It was not right that it should be left to associations of voluntary persons to enforce the law as had been attempted by a branch of the Christian Social Union. On page 234 of the Report, one of the inspectors said—

> "In one factory I found every machinist hopelessly in debt to her employer, working on to discharge a debt which grows instead of diminishing."

That was a worse state of things than existed in coal mines eighty or ninety years ago. He was inclined to agree with the great French socialist writer, M. Jaurès, that the endeavouring to persuade employers on this point was like trying to "Persuade the golden calf to mint himself into sovereigns." If the Truck law was a right law, then for heaven's sake enforce it. They were told on page 235 that, apart from Truck cases, only 2½ per cent. of cases taken into Court were dismissed, while of the Truck cases nearly one-third failed.

Next he came to the dangerous trades. Last year they took credit for having reduced the percentage of suffering, but lead poisoning was again increasing he regretted to note. There had been one death again from phossy jaw—a Bryant & May case—and it would be interesting to know if it was a result of work done in former years. Switzerland, France, and Germany were acting together in this matter, and desired an international agreement in regard to the lead trades, and, in passing, he would like to point out that the Dutch standard of solubility, 2½ per cent. in glazes, was twice as good as our tentative 5 per cent. The cases in china and earthenware were increasing. Last year there was a slight increase, and that increase was continuing. In the first six months of the present year there were fifty-three cases, as compared with thirty-seven in the corresponding six months of last year. There was one very severe case of the old type, in which a girl of eighteen was almost struck dead. Another dangerous disease was anthrax. It was increasing generally in the country especially in the horse-hair industry. It used to be associated with wool and Bradford; but it was even more dangerous in the horse-hair industry. Dr. Legge had lately been studying this matter in Germany; and he hoped that regulations regarding it would soon be put into force. He congratulated the Government on having accepted the invitation of Switzerland to the International Labour Conference, to be held in 1905. It was now many years since the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University went to Berlin. It was no secret that this Conference was being promoted by the Governments of France and Germany, as they desired to bring pressure to bear on the recalcitrant nations. The labour treaty with Italy was a gratifying evidence of the intention of the French Government in this respect. The Conference was called mainly to deal with two points, namely, the use of white phosphorus and the night labour of women. He believed that the Government had accepted the invitation in a very guarded form. No doubt prudence was desirable; but he ventured to suggest that it was entirely in the interests of this country that recalcitrant countries should be brought up to the mark. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said that he desired to exclude sweated goods from this country; but a better means would be to bring all foreign nations up to the proper standard in the hope of ultimately improving the standard of labour throughout the world.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That item A (Salaries, Wages, and

Allowances) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Secretary of State."—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*).

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said that in supporting the Motion of his right hon. friend he desired to call attention to the fact that this was the first debate they had had on a labour subject during the session, except on one Friday afternoon. Let them look at the benches! On a hot afternoon on the 4th August they were asked to discuss the welfare of many millions of their fellow-subjects. At the beginning of the year a new Act of Parliament, called the Employment of Children Act, was in operation. Under that Act, it was the duty of the Home Office to sanction sets of rules to be submitted by the local authorities; yet, up to the present, only three sets had been sanctioned in the whole of England. Eleven sets were provisionally sanctioned and thirty-six were under consideration. The rules for the City of London and the County of London were still under consideration; and the right hon. Gentleman had stated that an inquiry would be necessary into the by-laws of the County of London. That seemed to him to be a very unsatisfactory amount of progress under a new Act from which they hoped to obtain lasting good. The right hon. Gentleman might think that the employment of children only concerned their morality; but it also touched their whole future life and physique, and whether they would be useful or useless citizens.

He desired to draw special attention to the question of the physical deterioration which resulted from the indifference with which the law was administered. Public attention had been drawn to the subject lately, particularly in connection with the number of recruits which had to be rejected. He wished to ask the Home Secretary whether he was satisfied that the powers which his Department possessed in connection with this matter were being fully and wisely used; and also whether the right hon. Gentleman was satisfied that the Department had sufficient powers. He would ask one specific question. Did the right hon. Gentleman consider that if forty persons were employed in a factory they should be protected from an outbreak of fire, whereas if only thirty-nine persons were employed in a similar factory no such protection was compulsory? Was the right hon. Gentleman satisfied with that condition of affairs? He wanted a declaration from the right hon. Gentleman that he would consider the whole subject. The right hon. Gentleman had under his control a considerable number of factory inspectors, though perhaps not as many as he himself would wish. He desired to pay his tribute to the admirable manner in which those inspectors, male and female, carried out their difficult duties. The right hon. Gentleman had also a certain number of certifying factory surgeons who certified boys and girls entering a factory, though they did not certify in the case of workshops. One of the recommendations of the Committee on Physical Deterioration was that boys and girls entering a workshop should also be certified. Further, he would suggest that boys and girls should not only be certified at sixteen but also later. Was the right hon. Gentleman satisfied with the present condition of infant mortality? That was a very grave question; and there was also the question of the employment of women before and after their confinement. Was the right hon. Gentleman satisfied that the law, as it stood, was being enforced?

He came now to the case made out by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean with regard to the women inspectors. Any one who read the Report would see at once how unflagging in its efforts had been the women's branch, how devoted the women inspectors had been to their duty, and how successful in dealing with the difficulties confronting them. According to the census of 1901, there were over 1,500,000 women and girls in factories and workshops. In the laundry industry the disparity of men employed to women was enormous. In the regulated laundries the number of males employed was 8,400, while the women numbered 82,600, but in the unregulated laundries, the small domestic laundries, there were 9,600 men and 226,000 women. That would give the Committee an idea of the work which the women's branch of factory inspectors had to endeavour to overtake. He wanted the Committee to appreciate the importance of this work from what had been done by Miss Deane. It appeared from the Report that accidents had not tended to increase, but that in the area for which Miss Deane was responsible the accidents had decreased by one-half of the normal total. Most of the accidents in laundries were caused by the hydro-extractor, but none had occurred in Miss Deane's area. It stood to reason that there would not cease to be accidents so long as there were only eight women inspectors for industries employing 1,500,000 women. With regard to the carrying of heavy weights the Report gave a long list of cases. In this matter we were far behind other countries in the way we protected the workers with regard to these matters. He would just quote one or two of the cases. A boy of fourteen, who weighed seventy-seven pounds himself, was found carrying up a piece of clay to the moulder. That piece of clay weighed sixty-three pounds, fourteen pounds less than his own weight, and a woman fetching up clay to the moulder carried eighteen cwt. a day. Under these circumstances he thought he was justified in saying that the women's department was severely handicapped in their struggle to look after the comforts and needs of the women workers.

He deprecated the practice that had grown up under this particular Government of not putting into force the powers with which they were vested, but rather trusting to a voluntary system and persuasion. His right hon. friend had asked for a Committee to be appointed, but there had been quite enough Committees on this subject. The Government knew perfectly well what they ought to do, but would not do it. They accepted neither the recommendations of their inspectors nor of the Committees which had considered this matter. It would, no doubt, be stated that the voluntary system had worked well in the Bessemer steel and wharfinger trades, but even if the various firms in the bronzing trade, to whom the right hon. Gentleman had sent a circular making various suggestions, accepted those suggestions, there was no guarantee that they would continue to carry out the rules they had agreed to. That was the line the Home Office adopted; they made appeals and did not put into force the full powers this House had conferred on them. They declined to believe that anything was to be gained by uniformity of administration with regard to the question of the electrical trades. He had been able to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman in the previous year on what he had done with regard to electrical works, but he noticed that the inspector of electrical works had made recommendations, which he desired to see in force, which were almost identical even in their terms with some of the recommendations made by the Committee over which he himself presided in 1897. Electrical undertakings had greatly increased since that day. This inspector had pointed out that there were now 360 generating stations in this country, 100 of which had been added during the last year. In those generating stations there were bound to be accidents but they were not numerous. Last year eight fatal and 153 non-fatal accidents had occurred. But twenty out of twenty-six of the non-fatal accidents which had occurred in one generating station were so severe that it was doubtful whether the injured persons would be able to resume their occupation. Had the right hon. Gentleman enforced the powers he possessed with regard to electrical undertakings few of these accidents would have occurred. The inspector of electrical undertakings reported that new designs of works were now being put up and that safety was being sacrificed to cheapness. This was in great contrast to what occurred in Prussia, where the authorities could demand copies of the plans of the works before the works were put up. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman would require changes to be made in such works. Those changes would not be willingly made; why, then, should not the Home Secretary use the powers with which Parliament had invested him? On 22nd February of this year a man was seriously injured at the Westinghouse factory. The manager was warned in June, 1903, and again in November of the same year, but nothing was done, and then came this accident in the following February. Under the system instituted by the

Home Secretary the manager's opinion was as good as that of the inspector. That surely was a position which ought never to obtain. If the recommendations of the Dangerous Trades Committee had been carried out, the accident to which he had referred could not have happened. Why did the right hon. Gentleman remain doing nothing beyond expressing hopes?

With regard to the question of anthrax, the Committee of 1895, upon which the present Chief Inspector of Factories sat, recommended that Russian and Siberian hair and bristles should be excluded from this country, and Dr. Russell had suggested that no eating or drinking in the works should be allowed. According to the Report of the Chief Inspector for 1902, four cases of anthrax occurred through contact with the kind of hair which the Committee of 1895 recommended should be excluded. One of the lady inspectors reported, in 1902, having seen this hair manipulated, not only in the same room, but upon the same table as that from which meals were being eaten. He desired to ask why this trade had not been scheduled as dangerous. The Government were deserving of censure for not having increased the number of women inspectors. They had endeavoured to foist upon the country a voluntary and bad system; and they had not used the powers with which this House had entrusted them. Pious hopes were not sufficient, inasmuch as they could not be enforced. To raise the standard of physique in this country, greater administrative efficiency was required than had been shown by the present Government, and he urged the right hon. Gentleman to evince a keener earnestness in the matters to which he had referred.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) drew attention to the administration of the Employment of Children Act. The fact that a large number of children were employed outside set hours to such an extent and in such improper occupations as to render them incapable of benefiting by the instruction given in the elementary schools had long been known to the public, and had excited a considerable amount of indignation. Six years ago the Government of the country were seised of the fact by an influential deputation which waited upon the Board of Education and represented the extreme waste of public money involved in the provision of schoolmasters under such circumstances. Five years ago he himself brought the matter before the House of Commons when, in introducing the Education Estimates, he urged that unless something was done to prevent this shameful overworking of school children, it was idle to vote the millions which Parliament was asked to provide for the purposes of elementary education. But no attention was paid to his warning either by the House or by the Government. The next step was the appointment by the Home Office of a Departmental Committee to investigate the subject, and to rediscover facts which were not obvious to the general public. That Committee consisted exclusively of officials, but nothing but praise could be given them for the manner in which they did their work. They made a most admirable Report, upon which was founded the Bill brought in and carried last year. That Act gave local authorities the power, but not the duty, of making by-laws to regulate the employment of children. That, he thought, was the only way in which social reforms could be carried out. The general principles might be laid down by Parliament, but the administrative details must be left to the people themselves, acting through their county and borough councils. The Act vested in the Home Office the duty of approving the by-laws made by the local authorities. That sort of power was a great snare. The idea of Parliament in granting the power was that anything extremely outrageous, any provisions contrary to the liberty of the subject or to general principles of policy, should be eliminated before the by-laws were allowed to come into force; but the Home Office and other Departments were apt to interpret the power as meaning that the local authorities should pass by-laws, not in accordance with the wishes of the people of the locality, but based on a general scheme invented in the Department, from which no departures were to be permitted unless very strong local reasons could be urged. He was afraid that the making of these by-laws was being delayed by the attempt which the Home Office was making to reduce all these by-laws to one common pattern, instead of allowing the great county councils and borough councils a free hand to make such regulations as they thought proper. The Home Office were requiring these councils to send up their by-laws for revision and they would not be passed until they had been examined by a number of officials who were imperfectly acquainted with the circumstances, and this was causing great delay in the enactment of these by-laws. Since 1st January only three sets of by-laws had been put into operation in England and Wales. Amongst the public bodies whose by-laws were under revision by the Home Office was the London County Council. Now if there was any public body fitted to make those by-laws it was the London County Council, who had done an extraordinary amount of admirable work for the Metropolis. Not only had these by-laws to be examined by the Home Office, but a public inquiry had to be held. There were certain capitalists and manufacturers who thought the London County Council by-laws might interfere with the transaction of their business, and no doubt they had "got at" the Home Office, and this had caused a vast amount of delay. He hoped the Home Secretary would tell the House exactly how these by-laws stood, who was opposing them, what bodies were objecting to them, and why this long delay in regard to the public inquiry, which must occupy many months, was taking place.

There was also the question of the theatrical and circus children who required the protection of the law. As hon. Members were aware, the theatrical managers had demanded that these children should be exempted. He also wished to know why the law was not being enforced in regard to the employment of young children in the streets. The general condition of the streets of London was discreditable to a country like ours. Putting aside the interests of the children, and looking at the question from other points of view, selling in the streets of London required urgent attention and reform. The Committee must consider that six years had elapsed since this question was brought to the notice of the Government, and the Home Office were still wondering and hesitating as to what by-laws ought to be enforced in the Metropolis and other towns in the country. These poor children were still being overworked and overdriven, and compelled to work many hours before they went to school and after school hours. And yet they went on spending money upon the education and training of these children, who were so worn out with toil that when they got to school the most merciful thing was to let them go to sleep.

*MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) called attention to the condition of cotton-weaving sheds, with a view to justify the statement which he made on behalf of the textile workers last year, and to claim that the law should be more stringently carried out than it had been during the six years in which it had been in force. The position in the trade was exceptional. As the result of a joint request of employers and operatives seven years ago, a new order was issued by the Home Secretary. During six years that order was not given a fair opportunity; the employers asserted that its provisions could not be carried out; and the Home Office advised that matters should be left to the good sense and good-nature of the masters. The operatives welcomed the inquiry which was directed by the Department last year. As representing, with his colleagues, the operatives on that occasion he asked the employers to assent to one condition—that, whatever the result of the inquiry might be, they would agree to have the law altered in accordance with that result, and they replied "Certainly." Then he asked whether, if it were shown that the standard of carbon-dioxide in the air in textile factories subject to the humidity regulations could be reduced to seven or eight instead of the standard of nine volumes per 10,000 volumes of air, they would assent to have the standard reduced, and they said. "Oh, no; the position is nine or more; no less." The attitude of the masters, he contended, justified the action of the operatives in declining to take part in the tests, for they were forced to stand where they were or to have their position made worse. In 285 tests that were taken it was found that in 205 cases the proportion of carbon-dioxide was seven volumes, in forty-eight cases it was between seven and eight, in twenty-nine it was under nine, and in only two did it exceed that standard. These results justified the attitude of the operatives, and their contention that the employers should not be granted any relaxation of the standard of ventilation. He was desired by the operatives to say that it was not their wish to press for a more stringent law; but they had waited patiently without having induced all employers to comply with the standard, and they asked the Home Secretary to insist that his regulations should be fully obeyed. The Chairman of the Employers' Association had said, "If it can be shown that nine can be maintained we will withdraw all opposition"; and the secretary of the same organisation said, "If you can prove it can be done, we will take down our flag and try to comply." The Home Office inquiry proved that it could be done, and was being done in a great many cases, and he urged that the Home Secretary should enforce the law in those cases in which it was being disobeyed. He pointed out that under the law two offences had to be proved before a conviction was obtained, and said that was an exceptional provision under the Factory Acts, and was not justified by the outcome of the Home Office inquiry and what took place at the previous conference with employers.

In 1892, when there were 729 mills in the district, three inspectors were employed; to-day, when the number of mills was 1,655, there was only one inspector, although work had to be done which in earlier days the officials were not called upon to perform. In these circumstances surely an additional inspector should be appointed at once, so that in future more of the requests made by these men would receive close attention. What could one man do with 1,655 mills to look after? One works in the morning would take up the whole attention of an inspector, and he would, therefore, be unable to attend to the others. This was not a mere question of catching men working overtime. It took a considerable time to conduct these tests. He hoped the Home Secretary would be able to give a satisfactory answer to the request for the appointment of an assistant inspector. He would quote the following paragraph from the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories—

> "It appears, therefore, that installations planned and carried out by competent engineers to keep the air of a shed within the prescribed limit do in practice fully maintain the standard, notwithstanding the inequalities due to local or accidental circumstances, provided that the appliances are kept in proper order and used to the full extent intended, and that their adequacy or efficiency is not impaired by subsequent alterations in structure or arrangement."

The Chief Inspector's Report made that point quite clear.

He should like to say a few words in regard to a question which had been giving considerable trouble. There had been many complaints in connection with the system of running factories overtime. While short time was being worked in Lancashire, there were many complaints of "time-cribbing." One inspector spoke of the working hours being increased by two or three per week by a few minutes being taken from each meal time. He knew one case in which overtime was actually being worked while the employer was in Court. The inadequate fines imposed for offences of this kind made it possible for an employer to make up the amount of the penalty by more overwork. He received as many complaints regarding overtime from employers as from workmen, and it was difficult to get the work-people to give evidence because any who did so soon had to find employment elsewhere. He asked if the Home Office would recognise a man in his position as secretary of a large trade union, and take proceedings upon the evidence which he could obtain. If it were known that the Home Office would do that, it would act as an important check upon the employers who made their people work overtime. Something might be done also by way of establishing a minimum fine, and by instructing the inspectors to take twenty or thirty or a hundred cases, instead of only two or three, because then the aggregate amount of the penalties would be considerable.

In regard to accidents in the spinning room, he regretted to have to complain that the Employers' Association had sent out a circular stating that they were prepared to support any employer who was fined for non-compliance with the rules concerning the guarding of machinery. During the last few years the number of accidents had been decreasing; but surely a number of those which now took place might be prevented. One inspector reported eighteen accidents—fifteen of which happened to workers under sixteen years of age—all due to unfenced carriage wheels and slips. This state of affairs could be remedied, and the inspector who wished to see an improvement should be supported by the Home Office, and negligent employers should be forced to take precautions. There was a considerable number of accidents in carding rooms in which revolving flat carding engines were used, and these could be prevented by the adoption of a small appliance which caused the doors to shut automatically and made it impossible for them to fall open by vibration. During the past three years ninety-five injuries to fingers had been caused by loom hammers and sixty-six from duck-bills, which could have been prevented by safeguarding those parts of the machinery and by lengthening or shortening the hammers so that they did not come in contact with operatives' fingers.

In regard to the supply of particulars and rates of wages, he pointed out that where wages were paid for piecework that fact alone was proof that particulars could be given by employers. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman would admit that the man who neglected to give in the particulars committed a smaller offence than the man who gave in false particulars. But as a matter of fact, under recent decisions, the fines had been less in the case of falsification than in the case of the man who had been merely negligent in his works. One inspector remarked that in one-half of the number of informations obtained it was proved that the particulars given in writing were incorrect. The operatives assumed that such particulars were accurate, and since such falsification had the effect of defrauding the workers, he hoped the Home Secretary would instruct the inspector to prosecute in more cases where falsification was proved, so that the fines would amount to more than the employer was able to pocket as a result of his action. The fines for falsification should be heavier than those for neglect to supply particulars.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he wished to join with the hon. Member who had spoken in a respectful protest to the Home Secretary against the manner in which this Vote had been brought forward at this late period of the session. It seemed to him that no adequate discussion of this Vote could be secured on 4th August. It ought to have been brought on in March or April. He considered that this was one of the most important Votes on the Estimates. It referred to the most productive army of the people of the British Empire. He noticed that when they were considering the position of the Army they could get not only one but several days to discuss the position of field-marshals, or whether there should be three buttons on the right shoulder of a uniform or two on the left. But when it came to the Home Office Votes there was not that interest in them which there ought to be. In fact, the Home Office had not that self-respect which it ought to have. It was the Department which was responsible for the safety, health, and well-being of 16,500,000 of the people of this country, who produced and earned the taxes by which the country had been made what it was. In these days, when they were told to think Imperially, and not parochially, it should be remembered that this Empire was made by commerce and sustained by industry, and that that could only be done by the sacrifice of thousands of lives. Every year 150,000 men, women, and children were injured or killed in earning their living. If that were so, they ought to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, who was the guardian of these 16,500,000 of industrials in the country, to bring in his Vote at a period of the session when they could discuss the sweating and brutal overwork to which the hon. Member had referred, and the conditions under which workers laboured in dangerous trades.

Having said that, he would get to the best side of his criticism. He wished to give his humble testimony to the excellent manner in which the Home Office inspectorate performed their work. The gratitude of the workers of the country was due to them for the excellent way they had discharged their duties. He had read with interest the extraordinary document produced by that staff in regard to hoists and teagles on the strength of which so many men's livelihood and even their lives depended. Another interesting report was that relating to explosives. The reports on docks and mines were also equally interesting, and he suggested to hon. Members that they should take these reports and that dealing with the physical deterioration of the people with them to read during the holiday recess, and they would find them better reading than the articles in the *Daily Mail* on which some hon. Gentlemen had been living too long. For the last five or six years a number of Members had been saying, "Was not this practical administration going too far?" In some particulars it was. But he was one of those Britons who would like to place his country before any other in the world for the moralisation of capital and industry. It was now thirteen years since they had had an International Conference on industrial subjects in Berlin. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman, the Home Secretary, that he might co-operate with the other Powers of Europe and America, to have another such conference, so that they could bring up to date the discussion of such questions as child labour, women labour, employment in dangerous trades, night-work, ventilation, etc. Extraordinarily good work might be done by such a conference.

Having made that suggestion, he wanted to support the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean in his plea in regard to the insufficiency of the factory inspectorate. There were 250,000 factories and workshops in this country; and notwithstanding what the Jeremiahs said as to the decline of British industry, these factories were increasing and multiplying. Nothing was more satisfactory to a real Briton than to see that these factories were improved as regarded health conditions. For these 250,000 factories and workshops, we had 116 inspectors and thirty-six assistants, or in all 152 inspectors who had to overlook 16,500,000 of people. He insisted that the Committee would be wise to insist on increasing the male inspectorate from 152 to at least 200, and that they should increase the lady inspectors by between twenty and thirty between now and next year. He declared that, measured by value to the community over whom the male and female inspectors had jurisdiction, the services of the twelve female inspectors were disproportionate. Relatively, the female inspectors did infinitely better work than the male inspectors, because their work had to do with matters which no average man could understand. He could not understand why the number of these lady inspectors had not been increased. Something had been said about the cost, but the cost of all the inspectors was only £73,000, which was a small sum—a mere flea-bite—in an expenditure of £140,000,000 which was voted every year by this House.

The hon. Member for Clitheroe very rightly congratulated the Government on the diminution of accidents in the textile industry. That was also true of mines and shipping, but was it altogether due to increased inspection? It was due largely to mechanical causes, and to improved mines and improved ships. The diminution of accidents which had occurred in the textile trade was not altogether true of other trades. There were increases in the number of accidents in various other trades. The Home Office might say that that was due to better notification; but he could not reconcile that statement with the figures. In 1897 63,000 persons were injured; that number increased to 112,000 in 1903. Making all allowances for improved notification, that was a great and serious increase. As regarded the number killed, the increase was also very large. In 1896 it was 596; and in 1902 it was 1,107. If hon. Members heard of a battalion of soldiers being wiped out, they would be properly sympathetic, and they would be naturally indignant if that loss were preventable. At least equal sympathy should be shown to the soldiers of industry. Some of these accidents and deaths had taken place in certain industries to which he wished to call the attention of the Home Secretary. A process of Americanising had been going on for some years in this country, especially in connection with certain industries. The result was shown in the greater number of men who were killed or injured. The Americanisation of British industry meant its brutalisation; and their business was to stop it as far as the law allowed. He should like to know the number of men killed or injured on the Savoy Hotel buildings under the American system, and on the electrical installation buildings in West London. The comparison would be interesting. They could not allow an increase of accidents in docks and on buildings while accidents were being diminished in mines and on the sea. The abstract of labour statistics for last year presented this grizzly fact—4,622 men, women, and children engaged in British industry were killed as compared with 4,262 five years previously. It seemed to him that that condition of affairs ought to be stopped and could be stopped. It could only be stopped, however, by an increase in the Home Office inspectorate, both male and female, on the principle that prevention was better than cure.

He wished to support the hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwickshire in his demand for lady inspectors in connection with workshops. A play was recently written by the wife of the present Colonial Secretary; and he was almost prepared to forgive the idiosyncracies of the right hon. Gentleman in connection with Chinese labour, because of the excellent work in the interests of British labour accomplished by his wife. He would advise every hon. Member to see *Warp and Woof* when it was resumed. It was the finest picture of overwork ever put on the stage. It was said that Mrs. Lyttelton had exaggerated; but he had never seen a play which visualised a workshop better. He himself went to see it three times. Of the 1,692 cases of illegitimate employment of young persons which were brought to the attention of the Home Office, nearly all of them were connected with dressmakers, milliners, and tailors. It should be remembered that this work was not a matter of international competition. It was merely to provide "Lady Gay Spanker" with a fifty-guinea dress for Ascot, or to enable some healthy, decent-minded girl to be presented to Her Majesty at a Drawing-Room. The customers did not know how women and girls were making their own shrouds when they made these society dresses. This work prevented the workers leading healthy and comfortable lives, and from having strong, healthy, and numerous families—not too numerous, however. Bricklayers, carpenters, and plasterers had their unions; but the women and girls to whom he was referring had no union. They could be seen in thousands crossing the bridges any morning between seven o'clock and eight o'clock, thinly clothed and badly fed and working under conditions which were a disgrace. They could not expect ladies to look into these matters; they paid rates and taxes for competent inspectors; and, in his opinion, there ought to be at least fifty lady inspectors in order to prevent women and girls being treated in such a scandalous manner. He remembered hon. Gentlemen stating that the special rules with reference to phosphorus would drive trade out of the country, and would not do any good. But the fact was that in consequence of the efforts of some twelve Members, not all of them Labour Members, the special rules were put into force and the result was that the number of poisoning cases fell to less than one-half of what they were. That indicated that they were right in their criticisms and were justified in their rules.

The next point to which he wished to call attention was the report on physical deterioration. With regard to married women's labour, which he would like to abolish altogether, the Report said that the infants were of a miserably debased type in many cases. What was the use of talking of soldiers and sailors for the Empire when the embryonic soldier was described as it was in that Report? What was the use of talking of our troops not being up to the standard they ought to be in the face of that Report on Physical Deterioration? That Report pointed out that "The employment of mothers in factories was attended by fatal consequences to themselves and their children, and that they would gladly see it diminished or discarded." That was his view. He believed married labour could be discarded, and, if it were, the number of fatal accidents would be enormously reduced. He asked those Members who in the past had tried to prevent special rules being made to deal with lead poisoning to listen to the cases he would now quote. He had a list from Dr. "A" of 177 cases of lead-poisoning among females. Of fifty children born to them alive, twenty had died in the first year, eight in the second, and seven in the third. Fourteen only reached the age of ten years. But worse to him than the babes that died and the cruel treatment of the mothers was the shocking condition of the survivals. If hon. Members wanted to see the survivals, let them go with him or the hon. Member for Poplar. Let them go to the industrial schools, the idiot schools, the schools for imbeciles, and to the lunatic asylums where they would see in their later years the product of the children reared under slum conditions, reared only furtively by mothers who could not be mothers to them, because of the labour they had to do in the factories and workshops and the conditions under which they lived.

He apologised to the House for giving his view of the situation at such length. He did not happen himself to be a very big man, but he had the good fortune to be fairly strong, but nothing depressed him more when at the County Council than to see asylum after asylum brought under discussion, asylums filled with people who, if their mothers, who had not been properly reared themselves, had been able to rear them properly, would have now been pursuing a useful life. This could only be stopped in one way; by taking the women out of the factories and by preventing boys and girls from working in the factories for long hours. When these two things had been done, they could be provided with good houses, and in this way also the evil of drink would be greatly diminished. In these days when we were talking of Imperial rights and doctrines, and when these children were wanted to uphold the Imperial destiny, he pointed out that the only way in which that could be obtained was by the Home Office taking its courage in both hands, and raising its staff of inspectors from 150 to 300. If they did that they would do more to arrest physical decay than all that had been done, and all that had been said and written during the last century.

*MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said he shared with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down the regret that this debate had been postponed till so late in the session. He agreed that it was not very creditable to the sense of proportion of the House that a debate of this kind, vitally affecting the well-being of great masses of the British people, should excite such a comparatively languid interest. They were considering, as they did only once a year upon this Vote, the actual operation of the machinery provided for the protection of the lives and health of something like 16,000,000 of His Majesty's subjects. There ought to be no subject which ought to be of wider interest, and he was perfectly certain that those who were responsible for the administration of the Home Office always went away after these debates with hints which they were not reluctant to accept, and with deeper knowledge, perhaps, than even official reports could give them of the actual conditions under which industry was carried on, and of the complaints of those who suffered, not so much from bad laws as imperfect administration. One was often amazed at the loose talk which prevailed about what was called the over-inspection of industry in this country. The whole of these 16,000,000 of operatives of whom he had been speaking had only 150 persons to administer the law for their protection, and that was a sensible increase compared with the past. When he was at the Home Office the number was less than 100. What could 150 inspectors do effectually to superintend the administration of the law affecting such vast masses of the population? We had only to take other European countries to find more stringent laws, and a more stringent administration of the laws. So far from suffering from over-inspection, we should never get that minimum of health and safety which the public conscience demanded until we had a much larger inspectorate. He hoped to see a gradual and progressive increase in the total number of the staff.

He wanted more particularly to add a word in support of the appeal made as regarded lady inspectors. When he went to the Home Office there were no lady inspectors. When he proposed to take the moderate step of appointing two lady inspectors to look after the interests of the women workers, he was told that it was a most revolutionary and pernicious innovation. Efforts were made to prevent a step which everybody now admitted to have been not only necessary, but long overdue. He had watched with great satisfaction not only the falsification of the ridiculous predictions which had been made, but the gradual development of this branch of the Department by his successors at the Home Office. In his opinion, it was still very much below the strength which it ought to reach. There were in the Estimates this year eight lady inspectors. That was totally inadequate, and although it was perfectly right to attach one lady for the time being to the Potteries—he had argued that himself as being most desirable—such a step ought not to be taken at the risk of weakening the efficiency of the Department as a whole. He was sure the Committee would gladly vote the small extra sum needed to replace that lady, or, indeed, to add two or three others to carry on the general work. The total Vote for the inspection of the factories and workshops over the whole of the United Kingdom was rather less than £70,000, which was small indeed when they considered the enormous sums they were in the habit of placing at the disposal of the Army and Navy and other Departments of the State, and he did not hesitate to say that they would get more value out of that £70,000 pound for pound than out of any other sum voted in the year. Economists as they all were in these days, no one on either side of the House, if the Home Secretary said he wished to increase his staff of lady inspectors in order that the girls and women of the country might be more efficiently protected, would be unwilling to accord him support. It had been pointed out that the necessity for the protection of this class of workers was as great as, if not greater than, ever before. They had only to read their newspaper daily to be convinced that, more from want of thought than want of heart—through carelessness, ignorance, or indifference on the part of the customer—women and girls were employed in making articles of luxury, not only at inadequate wages, but under conditions of health and hours which were a distinct violation of the laws which Parliament had passed for their protection. It was the most difficult and subtle of all forms of the contravention of the factory law, was the one which most needed skilled factory inspection, and was one of the main reasons for the appointment of lady inspectors. If those poor girls were to be protected as Parliament intended, they must have a larger body of the only class of inspectors who were qualified to do the work. He trusted they would get a satisfactory assurance on that point.

Mr. Asquith.

Then there was the question of dangerous trades. He was quite aware of the difficulty of the question, and the delicate task of dealing with the very complicated conditions of particular industries. At the same time he very greatly mistrusted the effects of a policy of what was called moral suasion. They had no security that their advice would be consistently and permanently followed. He would much rather lay down a set of rules which he knew to fall short of the actual requirements, but which would still deal with the substantial and main difficulties of the particular trade, than go pottering along year after year, endeavouring by exhortation, advice, and indirect pressure to get people to agree to things to which there was no security that they would permanently adhere. Of course, if they could get an adequate set of rules, so much the better. At any rate, let them make a step to deal with those dangers which were actually threatening the lives of these people. The question of anthrax was brought up year after year, but nothing seemed to happen, although there was a most serious danger which could undoubtedly be very substantially mitigated if proper provision were made for the carrying on of the trade in which it occurred. He could not understand why some effective steps were not taken to deal with that admitted danger, and he was afraid we were falling a little behind the standard which we ought to work to. Nothing would give greater satisfaction to all interested in the industrial progress of the country than to learn that the problem of dealing with dangerous trades, and the still inadequate protection of the workers, was being made the subject of that special legislation which Parliament had empowered the Home Office to frame and administer. The Home Secretary must agree that the points raised were of practical administration, and not crotchets, fads, or extreme suggestions by those unacquainted with the actual circumstances. By exercising the powers the Home Office possessed, a large step in advance might be made towards the attainment of the object for which the Factory Department existed, viz., the protection of the lives and of the health of the workers of the country.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) said the figures given by the hon. Member for Battersea with regard to lead-poisoning in the Potteries were somewhat misleading.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he quoted the total number of cases of lead-poisoning as given in the Blue-book, and did not refer particularly to the Potteries.

MR. COGHILL thought a very different impression was left upon the Committee.

MR. JOHN BURNS: As I have been challenged may I read exactly what I said? "The lead-poisoning cases in 1899 were 1,258, in 1903 they were 614." I did not mention the Potteries at all.

MR. COGHILL said that was the impression produced upon the Committee, especially when the hon. Member went on to speak of the mysterious doctors, A, B, and C. In regard to lead-poisoning in the Potteries, the number of cases last year was only ninety-five, as compared with 200 in 1900. The decrease in the number of fatal cases was even more striking, the figures being, for 1899, 16; 1900, 8; 1901, 5; 1902, 4; 1904, 3. Considering that there were 46,000 persons employed in the Potteries, of whom 4,700 were engaged in the lead processes, the fact that there was only three deaths in what must always be a dangerous trade would compare very favourably with the condition of any other trade in the country. It was true that there had been an increase of lead-poisoning in other trades, but he entirely repudiated the statement of the hon. Member for Battersea with regard to the Potteries, and regretted the hon. Member should have repeated the aspersion he had previously made. With regard to moral suasion, which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife had referred to, he thought there was very little moral suasion in it as the Home Secretary relied upon the special rules. It was shown conclusively that those rules were absolutely impossible, and in the form submitted to the arbitrator they were given up by the Home Office. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife was entirely wrong when he talked about the Home Secretary and moral suasion. Most of the cases in the Potteries were of a very light kind indeed, and in the china and earthenware trade the figures in regard to serious cases and deaths would compare favourably with any other trade in the country. He reminded the Committee that an insurance society had been started there, and he was told that this always had a tendency in the direction of a general increase in the number of cases.

* MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said the first point he wished to raise was with regard to the inspection of the fish-curing industry. They had heard a great deal with reference to that industry during the herring season, and had been treated to some very picturesque descriptions of the life of the many thousands of women and girls who were engaged in it. Last November he visited Yarmouth about the height of the season in this fish-curing business, and he was bound to say that a more miserable and deplorable trade for a number of women to be engaged in he had never seen in his life. He admitted that he made his visit with the conditions at their worst, for it was a wet day, and there had been rain for two or three days previous. So far as he could judge, the field in which the work was largely done was a sea of water and mud. The field was many acres in extent, and it was closely and thickly studded with the trays containing the fish, each tray being surrounded by a body of women. He urged the Home Secretary to appoint a specially selected inspector for this work who would go thoroughly into the conditions under which these women laboured, and would report to the Home Office. The work was very exhausting and laborious, and,

in his judgment, was quite unfit for women to be employed in. But if woman labour was to continue he thought it should be carried on under the best possible conditions. He saw many thousands of these women at work, and from their general appearance he should think it was work which begot exceedingly bad health. He was much surprised and alarmed to see the conditions under which this great industry was carried on. He appealed to the Home Secretary to have a special visit paid at the end of October or the beginning of November, and to arrange that the inspector should be on the spot for a day or two because much of the work was carried on by night as well as by day. The inspector, he was sure, would report in favour of a much severer administration of the law in respect of this industry, and of greater precautions being taken with a view to preserving the lives and health of the people engaged in the industry. He did not propose that women should be prohibited from doing the work, but believed that the employment was quite unsuited for women labour.

With regard to the appeals to the Home Secretary for an increase of the staff of women inspectors of factories and workshops he wished to make a suggestion to the Home Secretary, and it was that, if the right hon. Gentleman would increase the staff at some future time, would it not be worth considering as to whether he could not strike another vein for this useful part of the public service. He had nothing to say against the present staff of women inspectors, but he thought that it would not be impossible for the Home Secretary to select some women whose avocation in life had brought them in close and constant contact with working women of all classes in the country, and often under conditions where confidences were regularly exchanged between the classes to which he alluded, and trained persons who, by many years of experience, knew the workers well and knew how to sympathise with them and advise and encourage them. It was not for him to suggest the quarter to which the Home Secretary should look for such women inspectors as he had referred to, but he had no doubt that with the resources at the disposal of the Home Office it would not be impossible for the right hon. Gentleman to find many highly suitable and capable women with such qualifications as he had ventured to suggest.

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said that speaking as a factory owner himself he should like to acknowledge the very great debt of gratitude which employers generally were under to the women inspectors. There were many abuses which employers were not aware of until they were brought to light by the women inspectors, and he readily joined in the strong request which had been made by other speakers that the number of women inspectors should be largely increased, for he was sure that the adoption of this course would tend to the efficiency of factory work. He thought his own humble experience was well worth bringing to the attention of the Home Secretary. As the hon. Member for Clitheroe had said, it was amongst the young people that they were continually having these accidents, and he thought there ought to be more protection for the very young, because when they first left school and began to work amongst machinery they were very careless and they required extra precautions as regarded fencing. Owners of machinery were always ready to receive suggestions from factory inspectors to help them to prevent accidents. He supported the hon. Member for Clitheroe in urging the Home Office to act more vigorously and in making it more expensive for unconscientious employers to have accidents. To cheat people of their wages was a most abominable crime, and under the operation of the "particulars" clauses of the Factory Act he was quite sure the action of the Home Office had not been strong enough. An excellent suggestion had been made by the hon. Member for Clitheroe with reference to purposeful fraud, viz., that where several workpeople were being defrauded, the Home Office should prosecute not only in one but in all the cases. An important point, however, was that where a loom or weaving machine was putting in more than the proper number of "picks" or threads to the disadvantage of the workman, it might be a temporary default of the machine only and not fraud at all.

In any case some variation was unavoidable. Of course inspectors could soon discover the difference. The inspector must be careful to distinguish between purposeful wrong-doing and mere mistakes. But if the inspector found that these variations were habitually in one direction only and that to the disadvantage of the workman, once he was absolutely convinced by a sufficient amount of inspection that an employer was cheating his workpeople then he ventured to say, as an employer, the maximum penalties were not enough.

As to the question of cribbing time he was not quite sure that the hon. Member for Clitheroe made it clear, because in one part of his speech he suggested that the workpeople were being wronged while in another part he said that they were apt to wink at it. There were in most textile mills two classes of employees. There were those who were paid by the hour and those who were paid by the amount of work. The unfortunate part of the business was that in Lancashire, where, owing to the shortage of cotton, short time still prevailed, the hour-worker who was in the minority was apt to be defrauded. The great bulk of the workers who were piece-workers were on short time at present. The more hours the engine ran the more wages they could make. Therefore they were not under any inducement to report that the mill was running more hours than it professed to be. But if the engine was running more time than it professed then the time-workers were really robbed of the extra time. He was bound to say, from his experience of employers as a class, there were not many of that description. Whether there were many or few, however, he was sure the respectable employer of labour wanted these men punished as a disgrace to all connected with the trade.

He also drew attention to the condition of many of the common lodging-houses in this country. He did not know whether the attention of the Home Secretary had been drawn to the Society of Women Guardians in Manchester, which had published a pamphlet giving the experiences of a lady who for five days went to certain workhouses as a tramp, with a friend, and spent two nights in common lodging-houses. He had spoken on a previous occasion about the tramp wards, but in the common lodging-houses there was a state of things that many of them could not be fully aware of. Sanitary conveniences hardly existed in some of those places. There was no arrangement for bathing or washing; and the sexes were jumbled together in a way the law did not allow. They could imagine the moral effect on single women who had sometimes to move from place to place to get work or to visit friends. There were poor women who were as respectable as any lady in the land who had occasionally to make use of these common lodging-houses. The condition of many of these lodging-houses was a disgrace to our civilisation. In one place the lady tramp—and her *bona fides* was absolute—said the only sanitary con-convenience was one which was being used by at least forty people, this being a small closet which was perfectly dry and the stench from which was "enough to knock one down." Some of the lodgers in that house had been there for six weeks. There was a small sink by the fireside which was the only provision for sanitary purposes of all kinds. In another part she mentioned an instance of a casual ward where they could wash themselves but could not wash their linen. In the common lodging-houses there appeared to be no provision for personal ablutions of the most elementary kind. He knew the Secretary of the Home Office could only do a little, but he wanted him to do what he could to remedy this state of things. It was a matter of the greatest public importance that these places should be made civilised, which many of them at present were not. The effect upon tramps' families was deplorable. Yesterday he asked the Home Secretary a question regarding the recent publication of particulars as to making counterfeit coins. A criminal was brought up at the Old Bailey, and he gave as his reason for knowing how to do it that he had seen a full description of the operation in the newspapers. The Judge and jury were unanimous in strongly condemning the action of the newspaper, and he should be glad if the Home Secretary would inform the House what he thought might be done in the matter and if he proposed to do anything.

*Major EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said he listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. Member for Battersea. As to the necessity for more factory inspectors, he himself could not profess to speak as an expert, but judging from what had fallen from many hon. Members it seemed that it would be highly desirable to have more inspectors appointed. He was sure that the Home Secretary, if convinced of the necessity for them, would be the very first to come to the House and ask that the requisite provision should be made. In regard to the East-End of London it was not in the factories where the great evils existed. It was much more in connection with home work, and he for one had always felt that it would be a valuable measure of reform if some control over home work could be established. That had been done in America with, he believed, success. He had studied this matter closely in the East-End of London, and he did know there were places where conditions prevailed which were really a disgrace. The conditions under which the labour was conducted were inconceivable by those who had not made themselves familiar with the state of affairs. Reference had been made by previous speakers to the fact that poor people were sometimes engaged at very low wages in making articles of luxury to be used by wealthy people who were not aware of the conditions under which they were produced. This remark did not apply to articles of luxury or the wealthy classes alone. There was a craze for cheapness running through all ranks of the population. He came across an instance the other day where a dozen pairs of corsets were being finished for a few pence. Shoes were being made at 11½d. per pair; and trousers were being finished for 1½d. per pair instead of 6d. or even 10d. which was formerly paid. Out of that small allowance the workers had to find the thread and needles. These things were not worn by the wealthy. They were used by the poorer classes, and he believed if they could realise the conditions under which they were made they would gladly pay a little more for the articles. In that respect they were just as blamable as the wealthier classes, if any were blamable. It was absurd to try as the hon. Member for Battersea had done to raise prejudice against the upper classes and accuse them of luxuriating in finery produced by sweated labour. The play written by the Hon. Mrs. Lyttelton which had been referred to only gave one side of the picture and that not the worst side. These bad conditions had been undoubtedly largely contributed to in the East-End of London by the cutting of prices, due to the introduction of labour from abroad. It was absolutely impossible that a movement of this magnitude should go on without producing a disastrous effect upon hours and wages. Forty per cent. of the foreigners who came to this country were in a condition of absolute destitution, and that was having a very serious effect on our own working classes. He did not believe their presence in this country had much influence on the great organised trades, but wages had been seriously depressed in the small employments, such as the making of shirts, trousers, handkerchiefs, and shoes. Wages must continue to be depressed so long as there was an inexhaustible supply of very cheap foreign labour coming to the country. He was quite certain from personal observation that the poor people in the East-End of London, alien and English alike, were being dragged down owing to the foreigners, and to the cut-throat competition set up by the influx. It was amazing that hon. Members opposite who were apparently so solicitous for the welfare of the working classes should systematically ignore the injury done to our own people by the unrestricted importation of destitute foreigners.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton) said he wished to say a word or two in favour of increasing the number of factory inspectors. He pointed out to the Home Secretary the distinctly changed attitude of employers towards factory inspectors. As an employer for more than thirty years, he had seen what amounted almost to a revolution in the change of sentiment against employers of labour towards the inspectors. He could remember when they were regarded as a most deadly enemy, and when people were posted in particular places to await their coming. There was a great reason for the change of feeling. The objects served by factory inspectors were good for the respective trades. They had learned very slowly, as stupid English people learned everything, but they had learned surely, that it did not pay to have unhealthy workmen. It did not pay to have unhealthy conditions of work, and the consequence was that the conditions which they first regarded with aversion had increased the prosperity of business. Another reason why an extension of inspectorship was necessary was that they had come more and more to look on them as their advisers. In their large experience they advised employers on many problems which only inspectors could. The problems of ventilation were associated closely with the health of workpeople. He supposed many Members—certainly Lancashire Members—had noted with extreme pain that a much larger percentage of Volunteers offering from Lancashire were rejected on account of their physical inferiority than in almost any other part of the country. That was the result of the neglect of the problems of sanitation in their leading trades. Therefore, from the patriotic point of view it was necessary to face these problems. The time was coming when the Home Office would be used by the trades much more in a consultative way than it had been hitherto. The Home Secretary must provide for helping them in that way. He would say, as regarded employers of labour, that the old feeling had gone. They all as a body wanted to do the right thing. The question was how to do it. They wanted the inspectors to help them to understand what was the right thing, and then how to do it.

There was another practical problem, viz., that of cribbing time, which was a very great evil in his part of the country. That might easily be dealt with not by inspectors hiding themselves and furtively rushing to places; but by a mechanical contrivance, somewhat similar to one used at his own place, which recorded the exact minute an engine started or stopped. It was a most simple arrangement, and quite cheap. By compelling the use of some arrangement of that kind he believed the evil could be cured at once. He threw out these suggestions because he recognised the friendliness of the Home Secretary, than whom there was no official on the Ministerial Bench who could do more for the well-being of the people.

*The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) said that he shared the regret expressed by the right hon. Member for East Fife and others that this Vote should be taken so late in the year. He himself would infinitely rather that it had been taken at an earlier period of the session. But he should like to point out that under the new rules of procedure the Prime Minister had made it his practice to take the Votes in the order in which hon. Members opposite and the House generally desired. Another reason for the delay was that they had got into the practice of waiting for the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories before they considered this Vote. The preparation of this Report had become more difficult every year from the continually increasing amount of information that had to be embodied in it. There was another reason why the date of this discussion was later than usual. There was no more able or energetic servant of State than the Chief Inspector of Factories, and he had, in addition to his ordinary duties this year, a most difficult and delicate inquiry on hand in regard to the regulations at the docks. On that account the Chief Inspector had not been able to go on with the preparation of his ordinary Report in the same way as in former years. The hon. Member for Battersea suggested that the annual discussion on this Vote should, in future, be taken at an earlier period in the session, even if the Inspector's Report was not in hand. That would be a matter for consideration next year.

After all, the chief point in the whole discussion had been as to the adequacy or inadequacy of the number of the factory inspectors. As the right hon. Member for East Fife had pointed out, this question of the number of inspectors was not settled by their recent growth. He himself looked forward to a gradual and progressive increase in the staff. During the past ten years the male inspectorate had been increased from 100 and 150.

The lady inspectors had been increased since the time of the hon. Member for East Fife from three to eight. A large addition to the number of male inspectors had been made last year, and the result fully justified the action taken by the Department. It was now some three years since the number of lady inspectors had been increased. He had been carefully considering this question and had been very much struck by the unanimous opinion expressed that day on the point. After the inquiries which he had made, and after reading the very valuable report of Miss Anderson, he had come to the conclusion that he should be justified in asking next year for an increase in their number.

* Sir CHARLES DILKE asked if the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to say what increase he would recommend.

* Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he could not tell the right hon. Gentleman the exact number, because he was making inquiry.

* Sir CHARLES DILKE said his reason for pressing the point was that he understood that two ladies had been taken on temporarily.

* Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: At the present time one of the inspectors was temporarily resident in the Pottery district, and was doing most excellent work there. He did not agree with the right hon. Baronet that the women inspectors should be resident in any particular district. It was far better that the staff should be a central one, available for work in any particular district, and that they should be constantly in touch, not only with the other lady inspectors, but should also work in harmony with the male inspectors. Independently of the appeal which had been made to him, he had come to the conclusion that it would only be fair to increase the number of the women inspectorate. The margin upon which the Department had been working was a great deal too small, but hon. Members in this matter must be a little trustful.

Mr. TENNANT asked if the proposed increase would be more than the two temporary inspectors who were now employed.

* Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he was not including the temporary inspectors. He could not, however, explain further just now.

The right hon. Baronet had asked about a case of phosphorus poisoning. There was no evidence that the poisoning, of which the woman died, had been contracted in any particular works, but he had followed the case as far as it was possible for him to do. Then the right hon. Gentleman made a very serious attack on the administration of the Truck Acts. The right hon. Gentleman had been in correspondence with the Department on the matter; and, in consequence of that correspondence, he had directed the Factory Department to obtain the particulars of all the factory prosecutions under the Truck Acts between 1st January, 1888, and 31st May in the current year. The figures certainly showed that the administration of the Truck Acts had not broken down, and the Department was not negligent of the duty imposed upon it. No doubt the proportion of dismissals to conviction was high. During that period, 313 cases had been taken against 121 firms. In 229 cases convictions were obtained, eleven cases were withdrawn on payment of costs, and thirty-three proscutions were dismissed. His object was to show, without submitting further figures, that the Department was not neglectful of the duties cast upon it. The Department was prepared to take a part in the Swiss Conference in the hope that some good might come out of it, not only to the workers of this country but to those of other countries. The risk of fire in factories, and the facilities for escape had been carefully considered by the Department. He had promised the hon. Member for Berwickshire a short time ago that a Select Committee would be appointed to inquire into the subject. That promise would hold good, though the inquiry could not be finished this session now.

The hon. Member and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had asked for some particulars of the carrying out of the Employment of Children Act. That Act came into force in January last. Several hon. Members believed that great delay had occurred in respect of the setting up of by-laws, and that the blame for the delay lay at the door of the Home Office. The position, as a matter of fact, was that more than fifty sets of by-laws had been received from local authorities, and in each case it had been necessary to consider generally the circumstances of the district and also to examine the details of the proposals submitted by the local authority. The subject-matter being entirely a new one both to the local authority and to the Home Office, the consideration of the by-laws had been more difficult and had perhaps taken a longer time than the consideration of by-laws on matters with regard to which there had been long experience. Up to the present three sets of by-laws had been confirmed and eleven others had been provisionally approved. As regards the remaining cases, in twenty-one the Home Office was still waiting for replies from the local authorities to letters addressed to them by the Secretary of State on the subject of the by-laws, asking for information, making suggestions, etc., many of which were written two or three months ago. Where the local authority before drafting by-laws had made a careful study of the circumstances of the district there had been little difficulty in arriving at a settlement with regard to the by-laws. In many cases, however, the local authority seemed to have prepared by-laws without sufficient inquiry as to or consideration of the actual circumstances and needs of the district and apparently found it difficult to answer the questions in the Home Office letters. As regards the by-laws proposed for London by the County Council he had now received the Council's reply to his letter of the 15th of April. In substance the Council adhered to their previous proposals which, among other things, prohibited the employment of children under the age of eleven in any occupation whatever, fixed the same hours of employment for all occupations for children above that age, and imposed a maximum weekly limit of twenty hours on the employment of all children liable to attend school, whether full or half time. He informed the Council in his letter that having regard to the size of London, the number of its inhabitants, and the different conditions of life in various parts, it would probably be necessary to hold an inquiry at which all persons interested in the by-laws would have an opportunity of being heard, and though the County Council in their reply said that "having regard to the very valuable evidence given before the Inter-departmental Committee, they are of opinion that no further inquiry is necessary or desirable unless substantial objections to the draft by-laws should be submitted on grounds not considered by the Committee, or from classes of the community not represented before the Committee," it seemed clear that such an inquiry would be necessary before by-laws of such a sweeping character as proposed by the Council or anything like them could properly be confirmed. There had been no idea of forcing upon local authorities any cast-iron or pattern by-laws. The Department had acted with the local authorities to the best of its ability to provide rules sufficient for the purpose and suitable for the locality.

Some very important suggestions had been made by the hon. Member for Clitheroe for the further prevention of accidents in cotton mills which would be fully considered by the Department. The hon. Member would see from the Report that in many respects his views were thoroughly shared by the inspectors. He could not deal with all the points the hon. Member made, but there was one subject he would deal with, the question of ventilation. The question of ventilation of humid cotton cloth factories had been under consideration during the year. It had been alleged by the manufacturers that the standard fixed by the Factory Act of nine parts of carbon-dioxide to every 10,000 of air was too stringent, on the ground that while with the best appliances it was possible to conform generally to that standard, and in so doing they would usually work to a point well within it, yet under temporarily unfavourable conditions not under their control they were unable to avoid occasional excess over the statutory limit. In support of their allegation they referred to the opinion expressed by Dr. Haldane and Mr. Osborn in their Report on Ventilation of Factories that the present standard was somewhat stringent and might be relaxed. The manufacturers suggested that in order to determine the point definitely one way or the other an investigation should be made by an independent expert and they undertook to abide by the result of the investigation. He agreed to that proposal and invited the operatives to take part in the inquiry. That, however, they declined to do unless the inquiry were widened so as to cover the further question whether a more stringent standard than that fixed by the Act could be adopted for humid cotton cloth factories. The manufacturers' contention was a definite and limited one which could be proved or disproved at once by an investigation on the lines suggested, but a much wider and more protracted inquiry would have been necessary if the substitution of a new and more stringent standard were in question.

Mr. Scudder, an eminent analytical chemist at Manchester, was appointed by the Secretary of State to carry out the investigation, an appointment which was approved by the masters, and, it was believed, was satisfactory to the men, and the result of the inquiry, which had just been published, was to disprove the manufacturers'contention, and to show that "installations planned and carried out by competent engineers had in practice fully maintained the standard, notwithstanding inequalities due to local or accidental circumstances, provided that the appliances are kept in proper order and used to the full extent intended, and that their adequacy or efficiency is not impaired by subsequent alterations in structure or arrangement." In view of these results the manufacturers would doubtless accept the situation and, in accordance with their undertaking, make every effort to comply with the statutory requirement. That requirement would, of course, be fully enforced by the inspecting staff, and the suggestions which had been made in the discussion would be carefully considered by the Home Office.

Mr. Akers-Douglas.

As to the alleged insufficiency of inspection, the apparent reduction in the number of inspectors was due solely to a change of organisation. There was one inspector for the technical work, while the ordinary inspectors did the general work when visiting for other purposes also. Any change that was made was intended for the better enforcement of the Act. He would, however, bear in mind the hon. Member's suggestion that the Department was understaffed and would see whether any addition was necessary. The question of "time-cribbing" was a very difficult matter to deal with. One of the greatest difficulties was the existence of "scouting." He could not help thinking that the operatives themselves were prone to act as "scouts," because in many cases they were interested in the increased work done. He did not think the hon. Member's suggestion as to an interchange of inspectors would work over a large area, and he certainly did not like the idea of inspectors going about disguised for any purpose whatever. Another suggestion was the fixing of minimum penalties. Minimum penalties were always unsatisfactory, because if the magistrates thought the penalties too high they would simply dismiss the case. The hon. Member suggested that the inspectors might take up more instances in a particular case. He would have the matter looked into. With regard to women inspectors, in the making of the appointments the general fitness of the candidate had to be considered, and amongst the qualifications to be considered was certainly acquaintance with the life of the working classes. The lady should also be able to extend her sympathies to those whom she was appointed to protect and the class with whom they worked. He had recently received a suggestion which he thought was worthy of consideration, viz., that in addition to the qualifications which they now possessed they should have some experience in hospital work and nursing—not that they would have to do such work themselves, but it was thought that the operatives would go to them with much greater confidence if it was known that the inspectresses had this knowledge and experience.

As to the question of fish-curing, referred to by the hon. Member for Leicester, he was glad to think that matters in that respect had been considerably amended, and the hon. Member, if he would read the Report of this year, would see that many of the complaints made on a former occasion had been dealt with. He thought the hon. Member would admit that. Hon. Members ought not to assume because they had discovered one or two bad cases that the whole industry was naturally teeming with instances of that sort. With regard to the case of fish-curing at Yarmouth, which had been referred to by the hon. Member for Leicester, careful inquiry into the matter had been made. The case of Lowestoft last year looked very bad, but he found on inquiry that a considerable improvement had taken place. That view, he thought, was borne out by existing reports.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Not as regards hours.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that it was the sanitary aspect of the matter which he promised to inquire into.

There was one point raised by the hon. Member opposite in regard to the publication of certain matters in newspapers. He had already put a Question to him in the House on this matter and the hon. Member had been kind enough to say that the Answer he had given him had been quite satisfactory. He was afraid that he could not enlarge upon that Answer beyond saying that he was considering with the Public Prosecutor what could be done in the matter. He agreed that the instruction, if he might use the term, given in periodicals and newspapers upon this subject was to be condemned, and he would see whether measures could be adopted to bring pressure to bear in order that there might be no repetition of the complaint which the hon. Member brought forward. He did not expect that his answers to the requests made to him would in every instance have given satisfaction, but he assured the Committee that the Home Office was most anxious to carry out the administration of the Factory Acts in the best possible way.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE appealed to hon. Members to allow a division to be taken at this point on the Amendment, as they were anxious to pass on to the discussion of other important questions.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 101; Noes, 170. (Division List No. 309.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt. E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph

Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Tennant.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan David. J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Rt Hn J. Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne)
Whitmore Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) called the attention of the Home Secretary to the recent case of "Sievier *v.* Duke," and to the fact that a police-officer holding the rank of inspector was called to give evidence as to the repute of one of the parties. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would frame regulations which would, in future, prevent officers of police doing what had been done by that officer. Such conduct was reprehensible and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give the House some assurance that steps had been taken to prevent its recurrence.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that the officer was subpœnaed to give evidence as to the character of the plaintiff. There was nothing irregular in the proceeding. When a plaintiff sued for damages for defamation, the defendant might, in mitigation of damages, call witnesses to show the general bad character of the plaintiff. The policeman, being called, had to state what he knew as to the general character of the plaintiff. He received no reward or gratuity other than the ordinary conduct money which must accompany the service of a subpœna. So far as the individual case went, there was no ground for any censure or disapproval. On the general question there was no doubt that it was, as a general rule, most undesirable for many obvious reasons that the police should give evidence on matters of opinion in civil cases, whether libel cases or otherwise. It was safe to say that, as a general rule, police evidence should be confined to questions of fact. Of course when a subpœna was served, it was necessary for a constable to appear and answer any questions which the Judge allowed to be put to him. No interference was possible there; but it was, in his opinion, perfectly proper and desirable to place restrictions upon the powers of police officers to grant interviews or give proof of their evidence on matters of opinion to parties to a civil suit. He had accordingly given instructions that no such facilities were to be accorded except after reference to and due consideration by the Commissioner of Police. He had ordered, further, that the conduct money or gratuity which a police officer should be allowed to accept and retain should be very small—not exceeding the rates fixed for expenses and allowances when an officer gave evidence in indictable cases outside his own district. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would agree that the point which had been raised by him had been satisfactorily dealt with.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES said he was perfectly satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he wanted to ask two or three questions of the Home Secretary as to the important question of street trading. After all, the first thing they had to consider was the interests of the children and not of the persons who employed those children. Everyone who knew anything about the condition of London streets would support the Home Secretary in issuing these by-laws regarding the children engaged in street trading. The present position was perfectly scandalous. Children were found, late at night, offering newspapers containing the latest winners, and naturally that led to numerous arrests on the ground that these children were wandering about without any visible means of subsistence. They were taken to the police station, kept all night, and then remanded for inquiry to be made. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would push the passage of by-laws to deal with such cases, and make some arrangement whereby the stipendiary magistrate might deal with these children without bringing them into the Police Court.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said that on 5th March last, a Motion was made for inquiring as to the various functions of all the Government Departments. The Committee reported on the Board of Trade, and on the Local Government Board, but left out of consideration the functions of the Home Office. The Home Secretary was really in this House the Minister of Justice, but had also to undertake the administration of the inspection of factories—a duty which the right hon. Gentleman had discharged in the most creditable manner. He agreed with the hon. Member for Bolton that sufficient scope was not given to these inspectors. He thought that our Consuls abroad should be instructed to tell us how we should battle with our foreign competitors in commerce; and the various functions given to this great Department of State should be reviewed and put on proper business lines in order to meet present circumstances. Then, as to the police force of the country, he did not consider that justice had been tempered with mercy. A case had occurred the other day of a poor woman who was summoned for not having sent her children to school, and she pleaded that her boy who was absent from school was minding an infant of twelve months old, while she went out to earn a few pence for bread for her children.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means from this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

Supply [20th allotted Day], considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES 1904-5.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,314,000, be granted to his Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

Mr. Louis Sinclair.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said this Vote came before the Committee of Supply some three months ago, and, with the general consent of the Committee, it had been postponed in order to give the House an opportunity for a deliberate estimate of the naval programme of the Government. They had had reason to complain at the beginning of the session that they had Navy, Navy, always Navy, and they were glad of the respite afforded by this postponement, but they did not expect that the Vote, which was intended to raise, and did raise, the whole naval policy of the Government, would be put before the Committee on a fragment of a day in the middle of August. He did not blame either the Secretary to the Admiralty or the Secretary to the Treasury, who were always ready to make the best arrangement possible for this. It was part of the result of the general mismanagement of the business of the session, which had been absolutely fooled away. It was with a feeling of despair that he approached the task before him of dealing with this subject. It was a task so hopeless and so thankless at this period of the session that he had been more than half tempted to throw it up altogether and let the Estimates take their chance so far as he was concerned. He would do, however, the next worst thing, and proceed at once to the large general question of the naval policy of the present session as embraced in these Estimates.

In the course of about ten years the annual expenditure of the country had risen by £50,000,000, and of that sum £20,000,000 at least were chargeable to the account of the Navy. The Navy Estimates had risen from £14,000,000 in 1894 to £43,000,000 in the present year, if they took into account the expenditure on works. The Shipbuilding Vote was the dominant feature in the Navy Estimates, and the kernel was the item now under discussion, the amount spent on the addition of tonnage. When the Navy Estimates were normal—when they stood at from £12,000,000 to £14,000,000—the Shipbuilding Vote accounted for about a third of the total. That was the proportion when all things were equal, when the Navy was neither extended nor diminished. He was far from saying that the rule of three should apply now, but it might apply to a certain extent. But if it did apply now then it followed that if the new construction did not increase, but the level reached this year was maintained, and £11,500,000 was spent on new construction and £18,000,000 was the whole, they would find the naval expenditure of the country would be not £43,000,000 but £54,000,000. That was what he desired to draw attention to. In passing this Vote to-night they were sanctioning a future expenditure, far exceeding calculations, of a most extreme character. He was not talking of to-day but of the future and of the heavy burden that would fall upon the country, because the passing of this Vote would lead to an automatic increase in other Votes, which would bring the Navy Estimates up to £50,000,000 at no distant date.

The Admiralty asked for £11,500,000 to add new tonnage to the Navy. He was an upholder of a strong Navy on every ground, and the Committee would have to consider whether this amount was sufficiently large or too large for the purpose for which it was asked. The explanation given for the first time officially by the Admiralty for this large programme was that it was no more than was necessary to maintain the two-Power standard. Let the Committee examine the facts of that allegation. At the present time, from the Report in his hand, he saw that we had battleships of the first class, 49; the next three naval Powers—France, Germany, and Russia—had 50; and all the other navies of the world 80. That was a three-Power standard. We had five-eighths of the battleship strength of all the rest of the world. In armed cruisers we had 28; France, Germany, and Russia, 27; and the rest of the world, 42. Here, again, there was a three-Power standard. In protected cruisers of the first class we had 21; France, Germany, and Russia, 13; and the other navies of the world, 16. In second-class cruisers we had 49, as against 27 for France, Germany, and Russia; and 59 for all the other navies. In third-class cruisers we had 32; France, Germany, and Russia, 32; and the rest of the world, 55. So that in the case of the fleets in being we were maintaining a three-Power standard. It was the same story with regard to fleets on paper. In battleships and armed cruisers we were building 39, as against 35 by France, Germany, and Russia, and 68 by all the other navies of the world. There was all the difference in the world between a fleet in being and a fleet on paper. The fleets on paper of foreign countries took a longer period to come to birth, and with regard to that Sir William White made this sweeping observation—

> "The unrivalled resources of this country in shipbuilding, engineering, armour and gun work, made it possible for us to keep the lead in battleships even though we started later than our rivals."

And he was quite prepared to abide by the judgment of Sir William White. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had had some experience of the Admiralty, argued that inasmuch as in the twenty years ending December last we had spent £116,000,000, as against £111,000,000 spent by France and Russia, we had only a small balance in our favour over the two-Power standard. He, of course, could not test the figures given for the expenditure of France and Russia, but he could test the figures so far as our own expenditure was concerned, and the figures given in the Estimates did not, it appeared to him, tally with the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. At the date of the Return we had unfinished ships in existence which required an expenditure upon them of £38,000,000, bringing this total up to not £116,000,000 but £154,000,000. The figures given by the hon. Gentleman opposite for a shorter period threw quite a different light on the matter. Here were the figures. During the last nine years this country had spent £70,000,000 on new construction, as against £82,000,000 by France, Germany, and Russia; we had added 933,000 tons to our Navy, while France, Germany, and Russia had added only 847,000 tons to their navies. Thanks to free trade our £70,000,000 had produced work which would cost the other three Powers £90,000,000 to produce. Our present number of ships was 400. If we went on at the same rate during the next nine years we would have doubled our present fleet.

His right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean reminded him about

Germany. Sir William White's statement did not refer particularly to Germany; but undoubtedly it was a new element which had to be taken into account. The serious thing undoubtedly was the rise of practically two naval Powers—Germany and the United States. As regarded the United States, the proposed shipbuilding programme was greater than that of this country; but he was not for a moment going to suggest a naval policy in relation to that. The whole defence of the Government was the two-Power standard. But what was the two-Power standard now? There was never any doubt about it when the formula was first invented. It was a polite way of alluding to France and Russia; but Lord Goschen broke through the reserve, and mentioned openly these two countries. But what was the two-Power standard now? He himself had never regarded it as the maximum. In the old days, it was not a two-Power standard in the abstract, but a two-Power standard in concrete. The French Navy Estimates had now been introduced; and his right hon. friend had quoted the words of M. Delcassé, but what about the other factor of the two-Power equation, viz., Russia? In the Report there was a reference to the cruisers belonging to Russia on the 23rd February of this year, but much water had flowed under the bridges since that date. Many good ships belonging to Russia had been lost; but it would be ungenerous to dwell upon that and ungracious to probe the exact amount of damage that the Russian Navy had suffered. It was not, however, to be ignored in any consideration of the two-Power standard; it would merely be a sham not to take notice of it. But he would not further discuss this painful matter to a friendly Power.

There had been considerable discussion on Army matters during the present session; but few people knew exactly what purpose the British Army was intended to serve; everyone knew, however, what purpose the British Navy served. He held that the duty of the British Navy from first to last was to seek out the enemy and destroy or render useless the navy of any country that might be hostile to this country. It also had a subsidiary purpose; and that was to defend these shores as well as the outside Empire, such as Canada, Australia, and other colonies. Further, it had to protect British commerce; and not only British commerce but Imperial commerce, a fourth of which was owned outside the United Kingdom, although other parts of the Empire paid practically nothing towards the expenses of the Navy. All these things were a truism; but they could only be carried out as long as the Navy was powerful enough to destroy the navy of any hostile country. The main purpose of the Navy, after all, was to be strong enough to destroy any force which might be pitted against it. The magnitude of the Imperial commerce of this country was in a sense its own protection. It was so vast that no hostile navy could afford to detail sufficient of its strength in order to destroy it. Therefore he would repeat that the main purpose of the Fleet was, not the subsidiary matters he mentioned, but its power to put an end to any hostile fleet. His deduction from all this was that the strength of this Navy must be as a general rule dependent on the strength of other navies. If that were good as a justification for increasing the Navy, it was equally good as a justification for decreasing it; and at the present moment the facts of the situation were such that the two-Power standard would call not for an increase in new construction but for a decrease. He desired, in conclusion, to put two questions to the Secretary to the Admiralty. He wished to ask him, in view of the facts he had stated, what was really the standard now; and if it was still the two-Power standard how did the hon. Gentleman make out that it had not been exceeded? Further, did the Admiralty, with nine months' additional knowledge since the Navy Estimates were framed, hold out any hope to the House and the country that any reduction might be expected in the future in the total of the Navy Estimates? Could the right hon. Gentleman hold out any hope that the Navy Estimates of next year would fall below the enormous amount at which they now stood? The other question he would like to ask was whether the hon. Gentleman could promise any reduction in the sum of £11,500,000 which was asked for building new ships? He hoped an affirmative answer would be given to these two questions.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that before he turned to the interesting and important speech of his hon. friend the Member for Dundee, there were three or four questions which he wished to ask. In the first place, they had a right to complain that the Report of the Boiler Committee had only been issued that morning. He had an impression that it was by no means a satisfactory document. He thought the Admiralty would find it impossible to defend the extent to which they had adopted a groping system. They had imitated Germany by recently installing both cylindrical and water-tube boilers. He understood, however, that that system was now abandoned; and that that showed that the Admiralty itself realised its mistake. Yet the ships in the Navy had a greater variety of boilers than that of any other navy in the world, with the result that it was admitted that the difficulty of stoking had been enormously increased, and that the different types of boilers in the ships had been the cause of misfortunes in the course of the manœuvres. He could only hope that the mischief was now over; and that boilers of a comparatively simple type would in future be installed, and also that the attempt to mix cylindrical and water-tube boilers would be abandoned.

With reference to new construction, the Committee would remember that adherence to the design of the "Edward VII." class for three new battleships had been generally condemned by the House of Commons. He hoped information would be given as to the design of the two new battleships of the "Lord Nelson" class; what the type was to be, and also information with reference to the new cruisers. With reference to the important and interesting speech of his hon. friend the Member for Dundee, his hon. friend began with a most justifiable complaint as to the lateness of the period in which the Vote was taken. He did not blame the Admiralty or the Secretary to the Treasury for that; it was due to the general muddle of Supply which had occurred during the session. The general practice of consulting the Opposition had not been followed during the year; and it was within the knowledge of the Committee that the Opposition had frequently suggested arrangements regarding Supply which had not been carried out. His hon. friend the Member for Dundee suggested that hon. Members who were in favour of a strong fleet had voted for a decrease in naval expenditure. That, however, did not apply to him. When he addressed the House, he showed the possibility of a reduction of Army expenditure; but he did not pledge himself to the possibility of a reduction of Naval expenditure. With reference to the two-Power standard, he quite agreed with his hon. friend that it was not an immutable law, and that it ought to be examined from time to time in order to ascertain what they really meant by it. In the present circumstances of Europe, if the two-Power standard meant the building of ships against France and Russia, as it had done in some minds, then the ideas on that question would have to be re-examined. Personally he had always thought that the two-Power standard was merely a convenient mode of arriving at the size of the fleet calculated to give pause to a possible alliance of three Powers against this country. He admitted that there was much less chance now of an alliance of three-Powers than there had been for a great many years past. The hon. Member for Dundee suggested that we had reached a three-Power standard. Personally he attached little importance to a long catalogue of battleships, which were lumped together technically as first class ships, all different in their age and nature. The United States and Germany were building newer ships more rapidly than we were. Effectively the United States had already become the second naval Power, and there was in the Mediterranean at the present time an American fleet more powerful than the French squadron. We could not contemplate these Powers being allied against us, and with care in the future it would be possible to revise our views as to what the two-Power standard meant.

With regard to battleships, there could be no doubt that within a year or two we should have to reconsider the whole foundation of our naval policy. Our position in the Mediterranean itself was a little old-fashioned, and would have to be reconsidered. Unless an alliance with either Italy or Spain could be counted upon, the maintenance of a great squadron in the centre of the Mediterranean, having regard to the purposes for which it was maintained, would become increasingly difficult, and ultimately impossible. His suggestion was that of all matters in which this country should proceed with caution, that of reducing naval expenditure was the one in which caution was most needed. No one could foresee what would be the shipbuilding policy following on the war in which certain Powers were now engaged. At present we had to deal with the rapid increase of only two fleets—those of Germany and the United States—and it was most unlikely that they would ever be allied against us. But the increase of the German Fleet had been supported by language which must make any Englishman careful; there had been, in language and in rapidity of building, a direct challenge to the naval power of this country. As to the suggestion that some more definite and tangible offer should be made to other Powers with regard to a reduction of naval expenditure, it was impossible for England and France, who might co-operate in such a proposal, to do so effectively at present. But after the war, when these matters began to be considered, he believed that England and France might usefully take counsel upon this point. Although they admitted that the naval programme of Great Britain, having regard to the vital necessity of the Navy to ourselves, must depend on the building of others, yet the only safe policy to pursue was not to attempt to thwart the Government in what they considered necessary for the maintenance of the position of this country, but to press upon them a reconsideration of the facts in view of the immense changes which were occurring in the naval position of the world.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that while figures as to the number, cost, and tonnage of ships in our Navy, and their comparison with similar facts connected with other fleets were most interesting and important, it was impossible by selecting particular years and particular ships to arrive at any really accurate conclusions. Figures might be made to prove anything. As to the two-Power standard, he would like to clear the ground and lay down the principle which he thought ought to be observed in regard to the two-Power standard. As to the standard itself, that was a matter for the House of Commons and the Cabinet; and when successive First Lords of the Admiralty had laid down the standard they had laid it down not merely from the point of view of their Department but speaking as members of the Cabinet. The duty of the Admiralty was not to set the standard, but to work by it; and he, as speaking for the Admiralty, assumed full responsibility in replying to the criticisms and suggestions made from the Benches opposite. He thought that the Committee would agree with him that it was better that he should not follow the details which had been raised as to the relations with various Powers. He would only say that they might regard it as fortunate that, whereas when the two-Power standard was originally laid down men's minds naturally turned to two particular Powers, because there was a possibility that they and ourselves might be brought into antagonism, it now did not come generally into our minds that there were any two particular Powers with whom we might be brought into antagonism. But notwithstanding that, with the necessary limitations and changes which were constantly coming over national and naval policy, the Government did adhere broadly to the two-Power standard as that towards which they were working, and although that standard might be criticised, at any rate no one had been able to suggest a better which could be understood and appreciated by the nation at large. When they came to work the standard he would rather put differently the principle stated by the right hon. Baronet. He would not go so far as to say that they could not work the cruisers on the two-Power standard.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The fleet cruisers you can.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that he would rather put it differently. Taking the two-Power standard as the standard to work to both for battleships and cruisers, he would put the matter thus. The numerical test was the proper test for battleships. The work which our battleships would have to do would be similar in character to that which would have to be done by the battleships of other nations. In regard to cruisers, although we might adhere to the two-Power standard, the test of equality was not numerical. Regard must be had to the character of the work they would have to do. In view of our immense commerce it was evident that more cruisers would be required for the defence than for the attack. The hon. Member for Dundee most correctly stated that Vote 8, and particularly this part of it, was really the governing factor in all the Navy Votes. He was glad to hear the hon. Gentleman state, and to hear no dissent from his words, that he would not be a party to starving other Votes when expenditure was necessary in order to maintain at full efficiency all the ships provided under Vote 8. If that view were adopted, it followed that Vote 8 set the standard. But the hon. Gentleman also stated that in normal times Vote 8 was one-third of the total, but that now, when the Naval Votes were increasing, that proportion had been considerably altered. The reason why the proportion to-day was different from what it was ten years ago was very simple. Owing to the advance of science and the change in naval policy it happened that an enormously larger proportion of the naval expenditure fell under heads which came in Vote 8 rather than other Votes. One of the very largest increases now was in gun-mountings. Gun-mountings were of two kinds. The fixed mountings came under Vote 8, and the movable mountings under Vote 9. The tendency every year was for the mountings under Vote 8 to increase, and their cost was much greater than the cost of those which came under Vote 9. There was no connection, so far as he could ascertain, between the proportion of Vote 8 to the remaining Naval Votes and the fact whether the Votes were normal or increasing. The hon. Member suggested that the naval policy of increased expenditure was inaugurated in 1892. He would rather say it was inaugurated following the Naval Defence Act of 1889. Of course when one started from a stationary standpoint such as had then existed for some time and began a large increase of shipbuilding, we should have two or three years during which the other Votes would not follow the proportion of Vote 8. That did not follow now, because we had been increasing expenditure steadily for some time, and if the Vote had not been at the stationary normal, it had been at the normal rate of progress. The hon. Member had said that in sanctioning this Vote 8 they were sanctioning an expenditure in future years of £50,000,000.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: If the rule of three sum holds.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said the rule of three sum did not hold. He did not think it had any basis in fact. The further comparison which the hon. Gentleman made was a comparison between the tonnage of our Fleet and the tonnage of France, Germany, and Russia. It was impossible to compare tonnage. We must compare the number of ships. If we took the number of battleships of the first and second class built and building we had at present the following figures:—France and Russia, 64; France and Germany, 61; Great Britain, 63. As to the speed of construction, the statement of Sir William White was perfectly correct as a general statement, but, as a matter of fact, the rate of building in Germany had latterly rather exceeded our own. The factor of gun-mountings was an important one which the hon. Gentleman omitted in comparing the figures of new construction. Gun-mountings were included in new construction in our Estimates, but not in the Estimates of Foreign Powers. The larger sum which was being spent on our new construction was accounted for almost entirely by the additional number of cruisers which we had had to build, on the policy he had just indicated, and by the inclusion of the gun-mountings. He entirely shared the hope of the hon. Member for Dundee that some reduction in the Estimates in future might be possible, but of course he could not go so far as to make any positive statement. All the factors which the hon. Member named as to the decreased expenditure by France, and as to what might be the position of the Russian Navy, would not be lost sight of when next year's Estimates had to be prepared, but it would not be expected that he could say now whether there would or would not be a reduction next year. As to the Boiler Committee's Report, and the right hon. Baronet's criticism of the Admiralty attitude as one of "groping," he imagined the Admiralty had been pursuing a policy of "groping after truth," and if they had found it that policy was justified.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: It is an expensive process.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that was so, but the problem was one of great difficulty. There were continual improvements and changes being made, and finality in that matter had never been reached. The Boiler Committee had to consider not only which was the best and most economical steam generator, not only which would give the greatest economy in the matter of weight, but also the questions of durability, simplicity of care and management, access for cleaning purposes and repairs. Had it been possible to say four years ago that the Yarrow and Babcock and Wilcox boilers were suited for naval purposes, a great deal of money would have been saved; but no such thing was possible; and the Admiralty had acted on the knowledge which they possessed at the time. If the history of the whole thing were followed, it would be agreed that no better policy could have been followed by the Admiralty. The right hon. Baronet asked him for information as to the design of the new battleships and cruisers which were shortly to be put out to contract. He was happy to say he could give that information. The battleship class would be known as the "Lord Nelson" class, and two ships were to be laid down of that class in contract yards this year—the "Lord Nelson" and the "Agamemnon." They would be ships of 16,500 tons. They would carry as armament four 12in. guns of 45 calibre, which would have a command forward of 27ft. and aft of 22ft., and ten 9·2in. guns of 50 calibre and 22ft. command. The horse-power would be 16,750, almost exactly the same as the tonnage, and the speed 18 knots, with a continuous sea speed of 16½ knots. They would ordinarily carry 900 tons of coal, and a deep load of 2,000 tons of coal. They would have 12in. armour amidships, 8in. on the upper deck, 6in. forward, and 4in. aft. The total cost would be about £7,000 more than the "King Edward." The cruisers would be known as the "Minotaur" class, and the four ships to be laid down this year would be the "Minotaur," the "Shannon," the "Defence," and the "Orion." They would be of 14,600 tons, and would mount four 9·2 guns of 50 calibre and 10 7·5 guns of 50 calibre each. The 9·2 guns would have a command of 34ft. forward, and 21ft. aft, and the 7·5 guns would have a command of 20ft. Their horse-power would be 27,000. Their speed on the measured mile would be 23 knots, and continuous steaming speed 21 knots; the normal coal capacity would be 1,000 tons and deep load capacity 2,100 tons. The guns would be well protected behind 8in. shields mounted on turrets. There would be 6-in. side protection on the main deck, 2-in. on the armoured deck, 4-in. forward, and 3-in. aft. The battleships would be very slightly larger than the "King Edward" class, and the first-class cruisers would not be so long as those of the "Drake" class.

They were powerful ships, and the Admiralty believed that they would be an advance on anything yet constructed either in battleships or first-class cruisers. He believed that they would prove a great credit to their designer, and be able to take their place in line of battle, and meet with advantage any other ship of their class which could be brought against them.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said that nobody who had followed the course of events in the Far East could have failed to notice the extreme importance of the work done by the torpedo boats and destroyers of the Japanese Navy. He desired to refer to the serious change which the Admiralty had made recently in diminishing the speed of our torpedo boats, whereas other nations had increased the speed. The reason for this speed was probably well known to the

Committee. The "Cobra," after its first trial trip, broke in half coming from one of our ports, and the Admiralty appointed a Committee of experts to inquire into the cause of this loss, and also into the general strength of our torpedo destroyers. The Report of this Committee had been issued, but in the public interest the Admiralty had declined to publish it. Its effect, however, was seen in the reduction of the speed of the most recently built torpedo boats. The Return showed that the average speed of our newest destroyers was not more than twenty-five and a-half knots, whilst those previously built had a speed of thirty-five knots. The average speed of the best boats they were building before this change was not less than thirty or thirty-one knots. He would compare these new boats with the most modern boats possessed by Japan and France. When he took the average of these new boats at twenty-five and a-half knots he was aware that when they were tested they carried a greater load on their trials than the Japanese boats. They carried a load of 100 tons, whereas the Japanese boats carried about forty tons. That would give our boats a speed of twenty-seven and a-half knots as against the Japanese boats with the same weight. In making these boats stronger the Government claim to give them sea qualities which the former boats did not enjoy. It should be borne in mind that every one of these Japanese boats were built in England and had to make their way to Japan. During the journey they had to encounter both rough and smooth water, and all arrived without a single accident. During the war with Russia they had had experience of all kinds and had been thoroughly tested. He failed to see why it was not possible for our Admiralty to build sea-going boats which would hold their own in all sorts of weather at a greater speed than the Japanese boats. Therefore, allowing for the difference in the load they were four knots behind the Japanese. That might prove to be a very serious factor.

Why was it that no other navy in the world was following our example, but were proceeding in a contrary direction and were going in for increased speed? Why had it become necessary to adopt this change? Because they were alarmed at the loss of the "Cobra." What did the experts say was the cause of the failure of the "Cobra"? First of all, because it was wrongly designed, that the workmanship was bad, and that the vessel had not been built by specialists in this particular class of ships. These vessels were supposed to attack other vessels and destroy them, but they would never be able to do so with this reduced speed nor, if necessary, themselves escape from the enemy. In view of the fact that other nations were going in for greater speed, was it wise to reduce our speed? That was a matter of extreme importance, and that was the reason why he had ventured to raise it. They ought to have some explanation as to why the Admiralty had disregarded altogether this question of speed. In the Japanese boats the speed was not only greater than in our new boats but the coal consumption was very much less. He thought that required some explanation from his hon. friend. Surely the Secretary to the Admiralty would not hold that under no circumstances whatever were they ever likely to enter into competition in regard to speed. If they happened to be engaged in war with another great naval Power they would be left out of the contest altogether as far as destroyers were concerned. They ought not to call them destroyers at all, because they never would be able to destroy anything.

*Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said that one point he had wished to call attention to was the matter of battleships, which had been raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, and had been fully alluded to by the Secretary to the Admiralty. He was sorry that the hon. Member for Dundee was not in his place at that moment, because he desired to refer to the speech which he had made that evening. He had had the pleasure during the last three or four years of listening to a great number of speeches from the hon. Member for Dundee, but he had never had the opportunity of addressing a speech to the hon. Gentleman, because it always happened that after making a long speech in which he brought an accusation of absence against the First Lord of the Admiralty he left the House. As he had said, he had listened to many speeches by the hon. Member for Dundee, who spoke semi-officially from the Opposition side of the House, but he did not even now rightly understand what his policy was. As a matter of fact he took the same exception to the hon. Member's speeches as Liberals took to the speeches of the Prime Minister on the fiscal question, that was to say he never got any nearer to coming to a conclusion as to what he was driving at. The whole drift of his argument, however, would appear to be that we must reduce our Navy, or, at all events, that we could not go on increasing our Navy. If his argument was carried to its logical conclusion the only inference was that we could not have the Navy we desired, and therefore we had better leave off building. The hon. Member for Dundee had told the Committee that evening that the two-Power standard was no longer operative, because one Power to which he alluded very delicately had undergone misfortune, which had altogether altered the situation. He stated also that France was hesitating in the progress of her naval construction. Although he was not a Member of that House when the two-Power standard was talked about, he had followed the debates, and he had never understood that the two-Power standard was restricted to any two particular Powers. If it was argued that France was reducing her naval equipment, or was hesitating in going on with her naval preparations, they might as well say that Turkey was not a very strong naval Power. As a matter of fact he did not think that they could limit themselves to any two Powers, but they must take a fair view of all the Powers of Europe. One Power that had not been alluded to was Italy, but it was an undoubted fact that Italy was getting the best battleships of any Power in Europe. A year or two ago one of the naval publicists, for curiosity or for advertisement, invited from all the Powers an expression of opinion as to which Power had the best battleship in the world. Of course each Power gave its own first as the best, but each gave the second place to Italy.

Mr. Reginald Lucas.

Another point to which he desired to draw attention was that it did not at all follow that every Power which was building up a navy was necessarily building against ourselves. In the German Parliament a year or two ago a protest was made that the power of Germany in the Far East was not strong enough. On that occasion the disadvantage to Germany was represented to be not as regarded England, but with respect to Russia, France, and, he believed, Italy. The fact remained that when they talked of a two-Power standard they meant at least that our Fleet must be strong enough to meet any two Powers which might come against us, and that was a limit that we could not with equanimity allow ourselves to fall behind. If the hon. Member for Dundee favoured a lower standard it was almost a menace, because the hon. Gentleman would undoubtedly hold an official position in the next Liberal Government, and it did give them pause if a gentleman of his weight brought forward such views when there was temptation on other grounds to vote against the present Government. In view of the danger to battleships from mines rather than from gunfire, as revealed by the war in the Far East, he as a layman thought that it would be a wiser policy than that of building huge ships to go in for smaller battleships and more of them. That was a proposition he would lay before Mr. Pretyman, and he would like to have the opinion of the Admiralty on the subject. As to cruisers the lesson that they were learning from the present war was that staying power was more important than speed. At any rate it was the first essential. In conclusion, he thought the Secretary to the Admiralty might tell them something about the shooting of ships which had been so much discussed, and also give them some information on that vexed question of the sighting of the guns on the "Centurion."

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) congratulated the Admiralty upon not having had to present any Supplementary Estimates this year. It was true that they had very large Navy Estimates, but the absence of any Supplementary Estimates allowed the country to give a sigh of relief. He agreed with a great deal of what the hon. Member opposite had said about economy, but he did not agree with him when he said that a two-Power standard should be rigidly adhered to and if possible increased. He did not think that they ought to go beyond that standard. He thought that it was necessary to put some check upon our naval expenditure if they were to have any success in their efforts towards economy, for which the whole country was sighing. The greatest growth in their expenditure had been in regard to their naval expenditure. The figures showed that they had spent about £43,000,000 this year, and he did not think that it was necessary to continue to spend such a large amount as that. He was sorry that some promise of economy had not been given them by the Secretary to the Admiralty. He thought they ought to have some stricter definition of the two-Power standard. He must say that the two-Power standard had ceased to have any meaning with the present Board of Admiralty. The hon. Gentleman did not tell the Committee exactly what it did mean. For forty years it meant that the expenditure of this country on the Navy should be equal, or about equal, to the expenditure of any two Powers which might combine against us. For a long period our expenditure on the Navy never exceeded the expenditure on the navies of any other two Powers. In 1883 our expenditure was 10·4 millions, and that of the next two Powers combined £14,000,000. In 1893 our expenditure was 14·3 millions, and that of the two greatest Powers £18,000,000. In 1903 the expenditure on the British Navy was 34·5 millions, and that of other two Powers £25,000,000. Now our expenditure was £37,000,000. In these very simple figures they had the story of the bad revolution this country had worked with regard to the two-Power standard. We now spent on our Navy a half more than any other two Powers combined. There was nothing in the circumstances of the world at present or in our relations with any other Power to justify our continuance in a departure from the standard formerly accepted by the country. France had adopted a most pacific attitude towards this country. The hon. Member for Portsmouth spoke rather slightingly of France, and said that in making these comparisons they might as well look at Turkey.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS said he only repeated what was stated by the hon. Member for Dundee. That hon. Member said that France was reducing its naval, expenditure. His own point was that they might as well take any other Power.

MR. LOUGH said the hon. Member had really not added anything to what he stated before. France did not stand to this country in the same relation as Turkey. France was the most important factor in the whole European situation and it should not be compared with a bankrupt and worn-out Power in the east of Europe. The pacific attitude of France towards this country was a fact of the very greatest magnitude. We have now had eight or nine months' experience of the alliance, and everything was going prosperously for a reduction in the expenditure so far as France was concerned. He did not see any reason anywhere for the great step forward we were taking this year. He was glad to see that there was a very strong Party in the German Parliament who criticised the huge expenditure that country had been going in for in recent years. He thought the German Government had considerable difficulty in pressing through their naval programme. He did not think that Germany would like to take on its shoulders all that its governors might suggest in regard to the new naval policy. In January this year the Emperor made a remarkable speech, in which he pointed out that this country was the sole cause of the vast increase which Germany had had to make in its naval expenditure. We were the root of this evil in other countries, and if they were going along so quickly after us, it was because we did not show any disposition to moderate our pace. Another great naval Power was Russia. There was no use mincing matters too much, and the fact was that the naval strength of that Power had of late been very much weakened. If we must suddenly increase our Estimates when new ships were built or laid down for Russia, why should we not modify our Estimates when Russian battleships were destroyed? This country was suffering greatly from the extravagance which had taken place in the last two years. The root of the matter was in Vote A which the Committee had been discussing, and if we did not modify our expenditure in that connection we would not be able to obtain a decrease in the total naval expenditure. The hon. Member who had just sat down looked with satisfaction on the fact that two new battleships would be built—the largest and most costly ever floated. We might not find safety in this huge increase of bulk alone. The experience of the war in the East showed, he thought, that more attention should be paid to the smaller and less costly craft. When the purchase of the Chilian battleships was sanctioned certain economies were promised, and the Committee naturally expected that these economies would be realised this year. He moved to reduce the Vote by £145,968, that being the amount included for the cost of one battleship.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "Th t a sum not exceeding £10,169,000, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

*Sir JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said he understood there was to be a considerable advance in tonnage and in the power of the armaments of the new battleships and cruisers. His hon. friend the Member for Portsmouth seemed to have a scheme of his own in regard to the two-Power standard. The suggestion of the hon. Member for West Islington was that they should leave out of account in the two-Power standard questions relating to the number and size of ships and guns, and everything else pertaining to war, and that the standard should be determined by equality of expenditure with expenditure of two Powers. That seemed to him to be a proposition which had only to be stated to be discarded. Equality of expenditure was a vastly different thing from efficiency, and it was no test whatever of the relative force of the maritime provision which might be necessary to protect our sea interests. The real test was the work we had got to do, and our power to do it. What the House should understand was that the expenditure was properly applied, and that there was no extravagance and no waste. He could not conceive why the hon. Gentleman opposite, who was a great apostle of economy, could propose a standard based on pounds, shillings, and pence.

MR. LOUGH: It has always been followed.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB did not think the country would accept the proposition. We had to consider our position as a sea Empire. We had to consider what were our duties and responsibilities and what necessarily would have to be the distribution of our forces which would produce a state of things in the face of an enemy that would paralyse his sea operations. The Admiralty said to the House of Commons that we must have a standard, and the House of Commons said it must be something that the man in the street would understand. We had to consider our requirements in view of rapidly changing strategical conditions. We had established a naval intelligence department, and the increase in our naval expenditure had more or less followed the work of that department. The Admiralty now submitted to the House Estimates based on considered plans, whereas formerly they proceeded by rule of thumb. In the old days our standard was infinitely greater than a two-Power standard. The old idea was that we must have a Fleet that could, if necessary, stand against the world. It was the advance made in the science of maritime war that had produced a much more difficult field for inquiry, and much greater difficulty in fixing the standard. There were obviously details which could not be explained in the House of Commons or to the man in the street; and, therefore, something had to be done to satisfy public opinion in the matter, and the rough-and-ready two-Power standard was adopted. When it was first announced to the House he accepted it as a necessity of political and public exigency, but in naval matters, as shown by the present war, it was essential to have a margin, and what that margin must be was a matter for careful and scientific observation. What this war taught above all things was that much depended on the ability of the Admirals, and upon things which could not be entirely expressed by the number of men, or guns, or the weight of armaments. It was not wise to blindly take a standard in order to suit Parliamentary and public exigencies, and to say "That and nothing more shall you have." He thought when they spoke of the two-Power standard they must always carry in their minds that there must be a careful survey of what would be the actual position and circumstances if we were at war. He rejoiced to hear that the armament of these ships was to be improved. He rather approved of the approximation of the cruiser to the battleship. That was only a consequence of what had happened in recent times. His hon. friend the Member for Portsmouth, who spoke with a certain amount of authority, seemed to deprecate the laying out of so much money in these huge cruisers and battleships, because they might run into a mine-field and come to grief. His own feeling, so far as the information he could obtain regarding the present naval war, was that the danger from mines was not all on one side. He confessed that he did not expect any great reduction in the expenditure on the Navy. He did not believe that the other Powers would stop expenditure, because they felt the necessity for developing their navies At the same time the Admiralty should exercise the greatest scrutiny and take all reasonable care to keep down the expense.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that the hon. Member opposite had some apprehension as to what would happen if hon. Members on this side of the House were responsible for the future of the Navy, but they were just as anxious to retain the efficiency of the Navy as hon. Members opposite. The growth of expenditure, however, was causing considerable uneasiness. There was a feeling on the Opposition Benches that the overhauling of the Navy was as necessary as the overhauling of the Army. He felt convinced that a great deal of money had been wasted on naval organisation, and that a great deal of work could be done by the provision of a cheaper and lighter craft. He advocated building more ships of the "Lord Nelson" type and strengthening the destroyers without sacrifice of speed. A better Navy could be provided, he believed, for less money, but that object would never be obtained until the administration of the Navy was inquired into by a Committee of experts.

*Mr. PRETYMAN said that the interest of the right hon. Gentleman opposite in naval affairs was appreciated by every one. But he did not think that anything would be gained by the appointment of any Committee of experts or a Commission to examine into the whole affairs of the Navy. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman would hold that it was the Admiralty, with all its defects, and not a Committee, which must manage the affairs of the Navy. He agreed that speed was an essential factor in the destroyer, but when they talked of speed they did not confine themselves to smooth water speed.

Mr. KEARLEY: Nor do the Japs.

*Mr. PRETYMAN: What information had the hon. Member for Devonport as to the speed which the Japanese boats were able to maintain? The comparison must be the average speed under such conditions as boats were likely to meet with at sea, and remain at sea. Of course, if they could obtain sufficient strength and at the same time increased speed they should naturally desire to do so. The old thirty-knot destroyers having developed dangerous weakness, it was decided, after the most careful consideration, and with the advantage of all the facts brought out by the Destroyer Committee, to build eight destroyers of a new type. The additional height forward would enable these vessels to use their twelve pounder guns in a way which they could not do in the present type; and there was the additional advantage that the coal capacity would be increased. These new vessels would have a nominal speed of twenty-five and-a half knots as against the former nominal speed of thirty knots. They would be tried under all conditions of weather; and the behaviour of the two classes of boats would be the subject of special observation at the manœuvres. The hon. Member for Devonport had referred to the expediency of calling in the advice of experts. He might say that some of the most eminent private firms had been asked if they could design boats of equal strength and greater speed, and unanimously they said that they could not. He could assure the hon. Member that the whole matter had been most carefully considered. As to the question of increased expenditure referred to by the hon. Member opposite, it was true that there had been a progressive increase in the Naval Votes; but the country had got benefit in exchange for that increase. There was an amelioration and an improvement in the position of the *personnel* in barracks, hospitals, pay, dietary, and in the position of the labourers in the dockyards. The total increase in these respects in nine years was £1,260,000, while under the Works Loan Act the sum which had been expended upon naval barracks was £2,500,000. It would be seen that with the creation of the Cruiser Squadron and the increase of the Channel Fleet the money had been well spent. He ventured to submit that no case had been made out for the reduction of the Vote this year.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 50; Noes, 148. (Division List No. 310.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, G.
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptEC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman Frederick John
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Hugh, Patrick, A.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor,Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Tellers for the Ayes, Mr. Lough and Mr. Bryn Roberts.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner,, James Tynte
Allhusen Augustus Henry Eden
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn. A.J. (Manch'r.)
Balfour,Rt.Hn GeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb,Rt.Hn. Sir John C. R.
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S,
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Dickson,Charles Scott
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dimsdale,Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. SirWilliamHart
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris,F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson,Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick,N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas Reginald J.(Portsmouth,
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton. Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
McArthur, Charles (Liverpool)
McKenna, Reginald
Majendie, James A. H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Norman, Henry
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Noes, Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes,

Original Question put, and agreed to.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) in moving "That, in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient that when important Acts of Parliament have been passed for a limited period any of such Acts should be included in a general Bill for the continuance of expiring laws brought in at the close of the session without affording any fair opportunity of considering the propriety of their discontinuance or of their modification," said the Amendment had been carefully framed in conformity with precedent and followed very closely the lines of the celebrated Amendment moved by the late Mr. Butt. It would not be in order in considering the Second Reading of the Bill to discuss the merits of the various thirty-five Acts contained in the Schedule. Only two questions could be considered—first, whether any of these particular Acts were suited for perpetuation in such a measure, and, secondly, whether this was a convenient way of renewing these various legislative proposals. One reason why there should be a real discussion on the Bill this year was that for the first time it contained the Vaccination Act, which the Government had agreed to put into the Schedule in order that it might be reviewed from time to time, but that concession would be entirely valueless if it came to be assumed that the Bill should go through practically without discussion. It was difficult to conceive a more cumbrous, clumsy, and inconvenient method of dealing with legislative proposals than that provided by this Bill. It was a weird constitutional expedient which had not even the justification of antiquity. All sorts of Acts were jumbled together in the Schedule without order, sequence, or arrangement; some were good, others were bad; some ought to be purely temporary measures, while others ought most decidedly to be permanent. But no discrimination was made. Nobody had inveighed more against this style of legislation represented by this Bill than the Prime Minister himself, while the late Lord Salisbury and Mr. Disraeli had also spoken strongly against the practice. He moved the Amendment, not with the intention of challenging the whole body of law contained in the Bill, but because it embodied in a concrete form the objections which might be entertained to this form of legislation. In the hope that it might draw from the Government some declaration of their intention in future years to depart from this undesirable method of proceeding, he begged to move the Amendment.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax), in seconding the Motion, said this was a subject which ought to be properly debated. The schedule kept increasing by the addition of Bills which there was not the energy in the House or the time to properly revise. He hoped that the next stage of this Bill would be put down earlier in the day in order that they might have a thorough review of this growing practice in order to see whether some of the Bills put down in this measure could not be removed by the process of consolidation. He thought the Bill dealing with corrupt practices might be consolidated and a Bill introduced on the subject and referred to a Grand Committee.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, and add the words, 'in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient that when important Acts of Parliament have been passed for a limited period, any of such Acts should be included in a general Bill for the continuance of Expiring Laws brought in at the close of the session without affording any fair opportunity of considering the propriety of their discontinuance or their modification.'"—(*Mr. Winston Churchill.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said those who criticised the present method of dealing with the subject were amply justified, but manifestly it would take a very large portion of a session to deal with the subject otherwise. The present Government had not found time to do so, but possibly the Gentlemen opposite, when in the course of events they came into power, might have before them no measure of great importance and be able to deal with that matter. He hoped the House would tolerate the present system for one year more.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked what the Prime Minister meant by "one year more."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I mean when the hon. Member's friends come in they may find time to deal with this question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said he did not know who the right hon. Gentleman meant by his friends, because he had no friends in this House except those who did their best for the benefit of Ireland. He remembered Mr. Butt, in 1873, coming over to Ireland and declaring that there would shortly be no longer this farce of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. He thought this measure was a great scandal and an insult not only to the intelligence of this House but also to the Irish Members. There were no fewer than nine of the measures included in this Bill which affected Ireland, and that was a proof of the necessity of

Ireland having its legislative business in its own hands. His hon. friend had stated that this was not a new importation into Parliamentary practice. That was true, but in its aggravated form it was not more than twenty years of age. In former times legislation of this kind was passed with the greatest apologies, but these things were all gone now. The Prime Minister regarded Parliament as a sort of registration machine. He would be very unjust to himself and his constituents if he did not protest against this to the utmost of his power.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that if the House would permit him to withdraw the Amendment he would not persist in it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

NAVAL PRIZE BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

CROWN LANDS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

ALIENS (EXPENSES).

Orders for receiving the Report thereupon read, and discharged.

PENAL SERVITUDE BILL.

Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd June], That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc., read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Mr. Swift MacNeill.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Order for Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee) read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

SOLICITORS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

NAVAL WORKS (PORTSMOUTH BARRACKS SITE) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TREASURY POWERS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

CHARITABLE LOAN SOCIETIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

LUNACY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

SEA FISHERIES BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

VALUATION BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 5th August, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiner that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5). The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill; Leyton Urban District Council Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment to be considered on Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments to be considered on Monday next.

Ilford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Glasgow and South-Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill (No. 181); Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill (No. 182). Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^{a} (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*), and reported from the Committee.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendment to each Bill considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a} (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee. Bills to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 13) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3.

*THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND : My Lords, I rise to move that Sub-section 1 of Clause 3 be omitted. I am very well aware of the extreme inconvenience, on an evening like this, of introducing any matters of contention on a private Bill; but my apology for doing so is that it is quite unavoidable. The whole story which I wish to lay before your Lordships is this. The city of Newcastle brought in a Bill to extend its boundaries into the county of Northumberland. The County Council of Northumberland has not opposed that extension, but it thought that in consideration of the extension it ought to get some benefit, and one of the benefits which it asked Parliament to confer upon it was the abolition of a certain

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

toll of a very curious and exceptional character, which has been enjoyed by the city of Newcastle from, I believe, time immemorial. I am not going to trouble your Lordships with the pros and cons of this toll and the reasonableness of the county council's contention that it should be abolished. That, of course, is a matter which it is impossible for your Lordships to go into.

But I may tell you that in another place the abolition of the toll was given in a clause so framed, and clogged with such conditions, that the county council felt that it was far more disastrous to accept it than to allow the toll to remain as it is. However, after protesting in the strongest way against the clause, it reserved itself for this House. The question was brought before a Committee of your Lordships' House, and that Committee was informed by counsel for the county council that we, the opponents of the Bill, would much rather not have the toll abolished than have the clause in the form in which it stood. The Committee considered the whole question, and came to the conclusion that the clause which had been framed in the Lower House was a proper clause, and that if we wished for the abolition of the toll we were to take it with those conditions attached. So far the Committee was entirely within its rights. I am not asking your Lordships to review that decision—that would not be right—but when this decision of the Committee was announced the County Council of Northumberland asked to withdraw the clause. The Committee, however, refused to allow them to withdraw it, insisting that the clause should remain in the Bill with conditions attached which the party who had asked for the clause said were more disastrous than not having the clause at all.

That is a position which, as far as I can ascertain, has never been before assumed by any Committee of your Lordships' House. I do not ask your Lordships to take that on my *ipse dictum*, because, although I have served on a good many Private Bill Committees in this and the other House, my experience cannot possibly justify such a statement. I have made inquiries of those whose business takes them constantly into the Committee Rooms of both Houses of Parliament, and they say there has never been an instance in which the opponents of a Bill asking for certain concessions, and having those concessions forced upon them clogged with conditions which make them no concessions, have been refused the right of saying they would rather not have the clause at all. If that is the case, I say this is against Parliamentary practice. I go further than that, and say it is against public policy, because it is evident that if opponents when asking for some modification of the provisions of a Bill, some concession which may make the Bill more palatable, are liable to be saddled, against their will, with conditions which are very onerous, which never would have been forced upon them if they had never asked for these concessions—it is evident that if this is done parties will be very careful in coming to Parliament for a remedy of those grievances for which, I submit, they have a right to ask in such circumstances as these. I am not for one moment asking your Lordships to reconsider the decision of the Committee that this clause, if given at all, should be given subject to these conditions. What I do ask your Lordships to say is that the liberty which has always been given to opponents to a Bill to withdraw a clause if it does not suit them should be extended to us in the present instance. I beg to move that Subsection 1 be omitted from the Bill.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, to leave out Sub-section 1."—(*The Duke of Northumberland.*)

THE EARL OF KINTORE: My Lords, as I was Chairman of the Private Bill Committee to which the noble Duke refers, perhaps I may be allowed to reply to him. Let me at once say that any criticism falling from the noble Duke on the decision of any Private Bills Committee of this House must properly command the deepest respect alike from that Committee as from the House at large, coming as it does from one of its most experienced chairmen. On a question of public policy I imagine we are all in general agreement with the noble Duke. Certainly my Committee was so, and I can assure the House that, were the history of this case what the noble Duke believes it to be, we should no doubt have done that which he asks your Lordships to do now. But I cannot admit that it is so.

The case, shortly stated, was this. Since so long back as the reign of Edward III. the city of Newcastle has enjoyed the right of levying what is called a through toll on various articles coming in there from, or going thence into, the county of Northumberland. When the Provisional Order came before Parliament for confirmation the opportunity was taken by the County Council of Northumberland to press for the abolition of that toll without any compensation to Newcastle. The Bill was under the consideration of the Commons Committee for, I think, over eight days, and their decision was that the toll should be abolished in two years, or at the most in four, but that on the question of compensation, which was not free from difficulty, it should be left to the Local Government Board to say, after proper inquiry on the spot, whether compensation should be payable at all, and, if so, to what amount; and the Committee proceeded themselves to frame a clause to give effect to this decision.

When the Bill came up this clause was embodied in it. The noble Duke's county council opposed it, seeking to have the last four lines struck out, the effect of which would have been, by undoing the Commons' decision, to free the county from toll without any liability to pay compensation. Their counsel and witnesses were fully and attentively heard, and my Committee had the advantage of hearing the noble Duke's own evidence and that of his vice-chairman; and in the end it came to this, that Newcastle would only accept the clause if it remained as printed, and Northumberland only if the question of compensation was decided in their favour. My Committee, in the end, arrived at the unanimous opinion that the decision of the Commons Committee was a reasonably fair and proper decision, and we determined to maintain it. It seemed to us that the effort of Northumberland to free themselves by a Provisional Order Confirmation Bill from the possibility of being found liable to make Newcastle reasonable compensation for the loss of this toll, was in effect an effort, by a side wind, to get behind the general law as enacted in the Local Government Act of 1888. To that proceeding we would be no party. We considered that in all the circumstances the proper course was to free the county from toll, and leave the question of possible compensation to be settled under the provisions of the general Act. I venture to think that our decision was a right one, and I hope your Lordships will not disturb it.

*THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: What the noble Earl has argued is whether the Committee was, or was not, right in saying we should not get this clause unless we paid the corporation compensation. That is not the question which I am asking your Lordships to consider. I am quite willing to admit, for the sake of argument, that we were wrong, and, that the Committee was right in placing us in that position if this toll is to be abolished. But I say he Committee had no right to deprive us of the liberty, if we were not prepared to accept that, of withdrawing the clause altogether and leaving the whole matter in *status quo*.

LORD GLENESK: My Lords, I rise, as a member of the Committee, to say only one word. As the noble Earl, the chairman of the Committee, has already informed your Lordships, we were absolutely unanimous in the decision at which we arrived. We considered the matter most carefully, and were surprised, after our decision, that the learned counsel representing the Northumberland County Council should have made this extraordinary demand, for which we could not see the slightest justification.

*THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I think that probably the House will expect me to say a few words on this matter. This, of course, is not an ordinary private Bill in which there are promoters and opponents. This is a Bill to confirm a number of Provisional Orders affecting certain large towns and cities in the North of England. Therefore, technically, the Local Government Board are the promoters of the Bill. In the other House the Northumberland County Council opposed the Order and made certain requests. The Committee of that House proposed to put in a clause which they thought was for the protection of the County Council of Northumberland. The latter council, however, did not like the clause, and they therefore exercised their right, and withdrew from the discussion on the clause, so that they might not be precluded from raising any matter of principle in the second House. When the Order came up to this House the county council opposed the clause. They were heard by a Committee of this House and the Committee confirmed the decision of the House of Commons.

The peculiarity of the matter is this, and to this extent it is, so far as I can find out, without precedent. The noble Duke lays stress on the point that it is very hard to force a body to take a clause which is supposed to be for their protection, but which they do not like, and I think he is right in saying that there has been no case—at least I have been unable to trace a case—in which such a clause has been forced upon those for whose protection it is ostensibly put in. But in this case, as I have said, the Local Government Board are the real controllers of the Order in the shape of being promoters. They think, as I understand it, that the clause is a good clause. This matter was brought before me as Chairman of Committees, but I said I was not a tribunal of appeal over and above a Committee of this House, and that it was perfectly obvious that this was a Committee point, and not a point of Parliamentary practice which should be decided by me in virtue of any instructions of the House. Therefore I told the County Council of Northumberland that if they wished to move the omission of the clause they must do it at some stage in the House.

The point in dispute is this. This through toll is a very ancient toll levied by the Corporation of Newcastle upon all goods, wares, merchandise, articles and things passing in and out of the city of Newcastle, and therefore it is a tax upon food and affects all the districts surrounding Newcastle. The Corporation of Newcastle raise about £8,000 a year in this way. There will be only one opinion in your Lordships' House as to this tax. It is a tax which ought to be abolished, and, of course, apart from the particular points which the County Council of Northumberland raise I am sure the House would be very sorry to continue a thoroughly bad tax as a matter of policy. All that is imposed on the County Council of Northumberland is this. It is distinctly stated in the clause that they shall not have to pay compensation to the Corporation of Newcastle. But there are these words—

> "But in the adjustment between the County of Northumberland and the city regard shall be had to the exemption therein provided."

Your Lordships know that when a great city extends its boundaries, there are questions of rating and adjustment of expenses which have to be considered, and under the Act of 1888 the Local Government Board appoints an arbiter to take these matters into consideration. The proposal in the clause is to leave this matter as one to which regard is to be had by the arbiter. I confess that if I was arbiter I should pay very little regard to it. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that the county council should not want to get rid of this toll, and I hope, even at this late hour, the noble Duke will not persist in his objection. If, however, he does, it is one which is perfectly fair for the House to decide, having heard the statement of the noble Duke and of the noble Earl who presided over the Committee.

*THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: My Lords, I am sorry to again trespass on your Lordships' time, but, with all due respect to the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees, I submit that he has raised an entirely different question, viz., the merit of the clause itself and the demerits or otherwise of the toll. If we are to go into that I must give him an answer. This is a toll which is paid by those who bring goods into Newcastle from a very small district around the city; it is an onerous tax on that small district of which the county council think it ought to be relieved. Whatever words you use, the payment for the removal of this toll is to fall on the rates. The rates of Northumberland are paid over a district sixty miles long and forty miles broad, and nine-tenths of the people who would have to pay for the abolition of the toll have no more interest in it than your Lordships. That was one of the reasons why we thought that to put upon the rates the compensation for the abolition of a local toll was unjust, and we resisted it. I did not raise that point before. To come back to my original proposition, I say, with all due respect to the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees, that it does not seem to me to make one bit of difference who are the promoters. Petitioners who ask for a favour have a right to withdraw a clause if it can only give them that favour acompanied by conditions which they think disastrous.

LORD KENYON: My Lords, I am instructed by the Local Government Board to say that, in their opinion, when a decision has been come to by Committees of both Houses, it should be upheld in this House. They therefore instruct me to resist the Amendment of the noble Duke.

EARL CAWDOR: My Lords, this is a very important question. It affects the right of opponents putting forward a clause for their protection to withdraw that clause when such obligations are imposed by it which make it inadvisable to accept it. I understand that on all sides it is admitted that there is no precedent for such a course. If so, I think we ought not to establish that precedent to-day. The noble Lord the Chairman of Committees has given reasons why he thinks the County of Northumberland should accept this clause. That is a matter for the county council. In this case they have a clause put upon them, as opponents, with obligations so onerous that they think they cannot accept it, and all persons in that position up to now have had an opportunity of withdrawing the clause. I hope the noble Duke will take the sense of the House on his Amendment.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," their Lordships divided—Contents, 38; Not-Contents, 46.

CONTENTS.

Marlborough, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.
Hertford, M.
Ripon, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Bathurst, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Crewe, E.
Denbigh, E.
Drogheda, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Onslow, E.
Selborne, E.
Spencer, E.
Waldegrave, E.
Colville of Culross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)

Balfour, L.
Brassey, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L.
Davey, L.
Farrer, L.
Glenesk, L.
Kenyon, L. [*Teller.*]
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Errol.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*) [*Teller.*]
Monkswell, L.
Rathmore, L.
Redesdale, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Argyll, D.
Northumberland, D. [*Teller.*]
Wellington, D.

Bristol, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.
Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E. [*Teller.*]
Chichester, E.
Derby, E.
Grey, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lathom, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.
Churchill, V.
Cross, V.
Knutsford, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Lichfield, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.

Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Armstrong, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Burnham, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Glanusk, L.
Hampton, L.
Hylton, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Newton, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Robertson, L.
Sinclair, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BRAZIL, No. 1 (1904).

Award of His Majesty the King of Italy with regard to the boundary between the Colony of British Guiana and the United States of Brazil.

TRADE REPORTS(ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3246. France (Bastia);
No. 3247. Spain (Galicia, Asturias, and Leon).

SEA FISHERIES.

Report of proceedings at the fourteenth annual meeting of representatives of authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, Thursday, 16th June, 1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to order); Amendments (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL BILL.

Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

LEEDS UNIVERSITY BILL.

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived and Bills to be read 3^a on Monday next.

THE BREAKWATER AT MALTA.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH: My Lords, I rise to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether Papers can be laid on the Table showing the progress made in the construction of the breakwater at the entrance to Malta harbour. As your Lordships must be aware, this is a most important work, and it is recognised as such by all those who have any cognisance of naval matters or the harbour at Malta. Owing to the increased size of vessels of modern construction, the harbour, which has never been sufficiently large, is now contracted in its dimensions, and I should like to know how soon we may hope that the breakwater will be sufficiently constructed to allow of a larger portion of the harbour being used. I wish to ask the noble Earl also whether it is anticipated that after the completion of the breakwater, Bighi Bay will afford safe anchorage for His Majesty's ships of war. This portion of the harbour is now practically useless, but it might be made available for ships of the largest size. I speak with some experience, having passed six years in service in the Mediterranean. Finally, I wish to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether any measures are being taken, or are in contemplation, for deepening and improving the anchorage in Quarantine or Marsamaseet harbour. This harbour is so shallow at present that it is only available for ships of light draught, but if thoroughly dredged it would be useful for vessels which cannot be accommodated in the harbour. There is another harbour lying higher up which, if properly dredged, would be available for merchant vessels.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I can answer my noble friend briefly. There are no Papers which can be conveniently laid on this subject. Good progress is being made with the breakwater, but I cannot name a date when it will be completed. It is hoped after completion that Bighi Bay will afford safe anchorage for His Majesty's ships. A considerable amount of dredging has already been done in Quarantine Harbour, and further work is in progress.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government the Question standing in my name—namely, whether they will communicate to the House the uses to which the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank have been put.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of SALISBURY): The deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank are invested by the National Debt Commissioners, and a Return of the securities held by them on account of the Post Office Savings Bank on 31st December is printed annually in the Postmaster-General's Report—a Parliamentary Paper. The Report for this year will be issued in a few days, and I shall be glad to send the noble Earl an advance proof if he wishes to see it. The securities must be Government stock or securities guaranteed by Government. The policy of extending the area of investment is considered and condemned in Paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Report of the Select Committee on Savings Banks Funds, presided over by Sir Michael Hicks Beach in 1902.

MACEDONIA.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, I rise to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is the case that the Russian and Austrian Governments have intimated to the Porte that they intend to increase the number of their officers in the Macedonian International Gendarmerie; whether this step has been taken without consultation with the other Powers; and whether it has been assented to by the Turkish Government. Since this Question appeared on the Paper an Answer has been given in another place, from which I infer that the reply is in the affirmative. Reading between the lines of this Answer I am disposed to think my inference is correct, namely, that the Austrian and Russian Governments have made this application behind the backs of the other Governments interested. If this is the case, it is only one more proof of the correctness of the view which is entertained throughout the Balkan Peninsular, that Austria and Russia have been, and are, working for their own ends, with the ultimate and eventual object of dividing up that country between themselves when the proper moment arrives.

It is hardly necessary for me to point out, because we know that His Majesty's Government are well alive to the fact, that we possess quite as much right as Austria or Russia in that part of the world, and if they should take upon themselves to insist upon an increase in the number of their officers, it is perfectly plain that we have the right to do the same should we desire to do it. I understand, however, that the officer who is responsible for the British section does not require any additional assistance at present. But should it be necessary to imitate the example of Austria and Russia and send additional officers out, I suggest they might be profitably employed in the Adrianople vilayet. Additional officers do not mean additional expense so far as this country is concerned, because the Turkish Government is made to pay for them.

I should like to utter one word of warning before I sit down against the view that, because everything at this moment appears to be calm, therefore there is no danger to be apprehended in the future. If the noble Marquess asserts that everything is going on all right, and if I, on my part, assert that everything is going on all wrong, I am afraid the noble Marquess is more likely to be believed than I am. His source of information ought, at all events, to be more correct than my own; but I must confess that from my own experience and from information which I constantly receive, I do not myself in the least believe that a satisfactory settlement is assured. I admit the success of the international *gendarmerie* scheme, and it is especially satisfactory that the work of the British officers has been conspicuously successful. But what I desire to point out is this, that if that country is quiet, it is not quiet solely on account of the presence of a few foreign officers. It is quiet, first of all, in consequence of the exhaustion from which the people are suffering after the proceedings last year, and, in the second place, in consequence of the presence of a large number of Asiatic soldiers, who live under conditions which long ago would have promoted mutiny among the forces of any other nation. When I hear of the departure of the vast numbers of Asiatic soldiers who are now in Macedonia, I shall believe that a satisfactory settlement is in sight; but under present conditions, I still hold the view that a general outbreak, followed by war, in that part of the world is merely a question of time, and that unless very close attention is paid to the movements of the Austrian and Russian Governments, we may find some day that this outbreak which I foretell may have been anticipated by some arrangement between these two Powers under which they will appropriate and divide the country.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, before the noble Marquess rises to answer the Question which has just been put to him by the noble Lord opposite, I should like to supplement it to some extent, as this is probably the last occasion on which we shall have an opportunity this session of referring to this important subject. The Question of the noble Lord merely refers to the Austrian and Russian demand for increasing the number of their officers in the Macedonian International Gendarmerie; but the matter is so important, and has excited so much feeling in the country, that I would ask the noble Marquess to state to the House the present position in Macedonia. We would like to know whether the convention between Bulgaria and Turkey has had any effect, and whether the general condition of the country is such that we may hope that peace may reign there for some time.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, the noble Earl has very considerably extended the scope of the Question put to me by the noble Lord behind me. I dwell upon that point because it may explain the comparative meagreness of the Answer which, on the spur of the moment, I am able to give to the noble Earl. It is true that within the last few days the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Ambassadors have applied to the Porte for permission to appoint more officers, six in the one case and five in the other, and I believe the Porte has raised objections to the proposal. The noble Lord suggested that this step has been taken behind the backs of the Powers and with some sinister object which he indicated plainly. There is nothing in the information before us to show that the step taken by the two Ambassadors was taken in such a manner. The question has been discussed by them with their colleagues at Constantinople, and I may take it upon myself to say that it is admitted by all concerned that this question of appointing officers is one which from the first has concerned not only Austro-Hungary and Russia, but the whole of the Powers who were signatories to the treaty of Berlin. We hold strongly to that position, and claim for ourselves the right to increase the number of our officers in proportion as an increase is made by other Powers. Originally there were to be sixty of these officers appointed by the Powers, and that number for a time was reduced to twenty-five.

Of course the question of the number of officers must in common fairness have some reference to the requirements of the different districts to which they are appointed, and when my noble friend suggests that we need not greatly exercise our minds over the question of expense because it was Turkey that pays the bill, I feel bound to reply to him that we must have some regard for the financial position of Turkey, and that it would be grossly unfair to impose upon her officers who were clearly superfluous. But there is ample room in Macedonia for officers who might be considered superfluous so far as the particular districts allotted to the different Powers are concerned. Such officers might be well employed outside these districts; possibly in extending similar measures to the vilayet of Adrianople, as my noble friend suggested, or in other ways assisting the Turkish authorities in the work of administration.

The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition invited a statement on the position of the whole Macedonian question. That is a very large order. The noble Lord behind me begged me not to imagine for a moment that no danger lay below the surface of the present calm, and I am well aware of the truth of that proposition. It would be an exaggeration to say, using my noble friend's words, either that things were "all right" or "all wrong." My own impression is that there has been considerable amelioration in the position of affairs in Macedonia; it has been slow and gradual as might have been expected, but I believe it has nevertheless been substantial. The *gendarmerie* officers have undoubtedly done excellent work, and their presence has been most useful, not only because they have been able to make some progress in the duty of reorganising the *gendarmerie*, but also because their presence has inspired a feeling of confidence which was lacking before. I have heard nothing but praise of the manner in which General De Giorgis Pasha has performed his duties and conducted his relations with the *gendarmerie* officers, including those sent from this country. I have also within the last few hours received information through the Austro-Hungarian Embassy of the progress made by the civil agents; I have scarcely had time to examine the documents, but I gather from them that the civil agents have been able to make tours of the country, a point about which my noble friend remembers there was at one moment a doubt, and that the effect of these tours has been to put a better face on the situation of affairs. I do not know that it is in my power to make any further statement, for I had no idea that the larger question would be raised; but I can assure the noble Earl that His Majesty's Government are anxiously watching the Macedonian problem, and that if we regard it more hopefully at the moment than my noble friend (Lord Newton) does it is not because we ignore the very serious dangers that always underlie the surface of affairs in that country.

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES.

LORD COLERIDGE: My Lords, I rise to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government contemplate making any, and what, changes in the Constitutional Government of either the Transvaal or the Orange River Colony; and, if so, whether Parliament will be consulted before such changes are made. My Question arises out of a statement made in another place a short time ago by the Colonial Secretary, from which it would appear that His Majesty's Government contemplate making some changes in the Constitutional Government of the Transvaal, and possibly of the Orange River Colony. I cannot help coupling that statement in my mind with the reflection that the Government have hitherto continually asserted that the opinion of the Transvaal is in favour of their policy with regard to the Chinese.

I do not think I should be prophesying in a hazardous manner if I ventured to prophesy that the first question that will arise before the new constitutional authority, whatever it may be, in the Transvaal will be this question of imported Chinese labour. There are only two ways of getting a genuine opinion from the colony. You may either grant to it complete self-government, or you may refer any particular question, such as the Chinese labour question, to a *referendum*. Those are the only two ways in which you can genuinely test the feeling of the country. I am not stating that I advocate the immediate grant of self-government. That is another question altogether, and I quite understand that the Government are not prepared to take that step. But is there any reason why they should not adopt the principle of the *referendum*? It was suggested some time ago by the Colonial Secretary, and it was refused by Lord Milner, not on any ground of principle, but on the ground of time. Time pressed; the Chinese must come, and there was not time to take the opinion of the country by that method. But there is no such pressure with regard to time now. It was said that a *referendum* would take six months. Well, six months may easily elapse without any harm arising to any policy of His Majesty's Government.

Is it to be said that the *referendum* is a modern or unconstitutional manner of obtaining the views of a colony? In 1896 the Colony of New South Wales decided by *referendum* a whole group of educational questions. In 1899 the same colony decided a franchise question by *referendum*. In New Zealand—and this, I think, ought to attract your Lordships' attention, having regard to the nature of the debate that is to follow to-night—there is every three years a *referendum* on licensing; and in New South Wales lately there has been a *referendum* to decide on the number of the members of the legislative body. Last of all, the important question of the Australian Commonwealth was decided by *referendum*. Therefore, it cannot be said that there are not precedents for recourse having been had to it. But if His Majesty's Government, without consulting Parliament, are going to give the Transvaal a representative Government which does not represent the majority of the white people in that country, and if that

Government so far approves of Chinese labour, and His Majesty's Government then claim that in view of that approval the Transvaal has given its consent to that policy, then I say I do not think they will be believed in this country, and the charge will be brought against them that they are trying to believe what they know, or at any rate suspect, to be untrue.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, I am sure the noble and learned Lord will not wish me to enter again into a discussion on the merits or demerits of Chinese labour, or whether His Majesty's Government were wise or unwise in not calling upon the population of the Transvaal to record in the form of a *referendum* whether they were in favour of the importation of Asiatics or not. The noble and learned Lord is anxious to know what the changes in the Constitution are which are contemplated by His Majesty's Government with regard to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. Let me deal first of all with the Transvaal. I do not think I can convey the information which the noble and learned Lord requires better than in the words of the Secretary of State himself. The Secretary of State, on the occasion of the Colonial Office Vote in another place, said, in connection with this matter, that—

> "The decision of His Majesty's Government is to substitute for the present nominated element in the Transvaal Legislative Council an elective element."

We believe that when they are elected the representatives will be able to express adequately their views as regards the action of the Transvaal Legislature in the importation of Chinese labour, and it is our belief that they will endorse and support the action of Lord Milner and the Executive in this matter. The noble and learned Lord will understand that the statement of the Secretary of State is simply a general statement. A general principle is laid down of an elective element, and the details will, of course, be the subject of full consideration between the Secretary of State, Lord Milner and the local authorities. The noble and learned Lord will see that it is impossible for us to give him any information upon what the decision as to those details will be until full consideration of them has taken place between the Secretary of State and the authorities in the Transvaal.

Now, with regard to the Orange River Colony, I have nothing further to add to what was stated by the Colonial Secretary in another place. The right hon. Gentleman said, speaking of the Orange River Colony, that no final conclusions had yet been arrived at by His Majesty's Government. The noble and learned Lord next asked whether Parliament will be consulted before any changes are made. If full responsible Government were going to be granted to any colony, in all probability that would be a subject for discussion in Parliament; but the noble and learned Lord knows perfectly well that that is not the intention of the Secretary of State. All he has said is that he proposes to substitute for the nominated element an elective element, and this change can be effected and carried out, according to the precedents of Mauritius and Cyprus, by a simple Order in Council. The details in connection with this change of Constitution have not yet been decided upon, and I hope the noble and learned Lord will see that it is impossible for His Majesty's Government to lay Papers dealing with the details of the scheme until they have been adequately discussed with Lord Milner and until a decision has been arrived at. I do not think I need say anything further, beyond telling the noble and learned Lord that it would be impossible for His Majesty's Government to delay action in arriving at a decision on the details of this scheme in order to give Parliament an adequate opportunity of discussing them.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, I would press upon the noble Duke and His Majesty's Government the very great importance in this matter of letting Parliament know what they do mean. I do not ask them to tell us now what they are going to do, but I do ask them and press earnestly upon them that they should let Parliament know before the matter is finally settled; that is to say, before the Order in Council has been finally passed they should let Parliament know what they intend to do, and give us an opportunity of discussing the question. There is no more difficult task than to frame a sort of half-and-half Government, which I understand to be contemplated. It is a system in which, from some experience, I am bound to say I have no confidence. But, be that as it may, it is a question of such importance that it ought not to be finally settled, so far as it can be finally settled by an Order in Council, without Parliament when it meets again having had an opportunity of discussing and considering the question.

POST OFFICE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, the Bill that my noble friend the Postmaster-General has asked me to submit to your Lordships is of a simple character. It is to remove a grievance which has long existed, and which has been frequently complained of by the public, with regard to charges that have been made on postal orders. When I had the honour of occupying the position of Postmaster-General this grievance was frequently brought before me, and I understand it also came before my successor, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. We could not at the time, owing to certain difficulties, remove the grievance; but my noble friend the present Postmaster-General has succeeded in doing so, and I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

LICENSING BILL.

House again in Committee (according to order).

Clause 2.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said he wished to ask a Question with regard to the words which the noble Earl beside him had proposed to leave out the previous night. He wished to know how the words found their way into the Bill. They were not discussed, and owing to the application of the closure were inserted in the Bill without any information being given to the other House upon them. As the Bill was introduced the words were—

"Calculated as if this Act had not passed."

The Bill in that form passed the Second Reading and through Committee, and a member of the Government stated in the House of Commons that the difficulty which the noble Lord had alluded to the previous night could not arise. But on Report Stage the words—

"Calculated as if the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were applicable immediately before the passing of this Act"

were introduced. Sub-section 1 now read as follows—

"Where quarter sessions refuse the renewal of a licence under this Act, a sum equal to the difference between the value of the licensed premises, calculated as if the licence were subject to the same conditions of renewal as were applicable immediately before the passing of this Act, and the value which those premises would bear if they were not licensed premises, shall be paid as compensation to the persons interested in the licensed premises."

He contended that the words which the Government had substituted in that sub-section completely revolutionised that particular proposal. No information had been given as to the reason for these words being adopted, and he ventured to ask the Government to explain why this fundamental change was made.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess OF SALISBURY): I feel that I am placed in a position of some difficulty, because I am not sure that it is quite regular for me to dilate upon what happened in another place. But with the leave of the House I might perhaps go so far as to say that the reason the change was made was that the late Attorney-General, Sir Robert Reid, thought the words as they stand in the Bill now were clearer than he words in the Bill as introduced. So far as I know, there is no difference in the meaning of the words, which the Government inserted out of deference to the wish of Sir Robert Reid.

EARL GREY moved an Amendment with the object of providing that in any case where the value of the licensed premises had been enhanced by the refusal to renew any other licences the compensation should be assessed as if the value had not been so enhanced; in other words, he proposed that where the renewal of a licence was refused a sum equal to the difference between the value of the premises licensed and unlicensed should be given, subject to a deduction of the amount by which the value had been enhanced owing to the refusal to renew any other licences in the neighbourhood. The noble Earl said his object was to give the noble Marquess opposite another opportunity of repeating the offer he made the previous night, that His Majesty's Government would be prepared to consider on the Report Stage an Amendment to the same effect as that he had moved late the previous night. The noble Marquess's offer apparently did not reach the ears of the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, but it was of such importance that he desired, as no report of it appeared in the newspapers, that the noble Marquess should make another statement to the same effect. He did not propose to repeat the arguments he used the previous night, but he believed the clause as drafted was quite out of harmony with the spirit of the Bill, inasmuch as it gave to existing licence-holders that monopoly value which arose from the suppression of competing houses. He could not help hoping that the Government would be able between now and the Report stage to consider favourably an Amendment which would prevent that monopoly value which resulted to existing houses from the suppression of other houses being given to private individuals.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 8, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and, in any case where the value of the licensed premises has been enhanced by the refusal to renew any other licence under this Act, as if the licence had not been so enhanced.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The Amendment which the noble Earl has just moved is not on the Paper, and there is a manifest inconvenience in discussing an Amendment of this character, the terms of which are not in print before us. I am quite willing to repeat what I said last night, though not at such length. The Government feel that this provision deals with the most intricate part of the machinery of the Bill, the basis of compensation, and I endeavoured to the best of my ability to explain to the House how I thought the matter stood, and I stated that, as at present advised, the Government could not accept the Amendment the noble Earl moved. But I did suggest to the noble Earl, and I repeat the suggestion, that his opportunities are not exhausted on this stage, and that if he will bring the matter up again on Report the Government will carefully consider it.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said the extreme modesty of the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal had landed the House in considerable difficulty. The noble Marquess was so afraid to allude to anything that had passed in the House of Commons that he absolutely refused to give a clear and distinct explanation upon many points. He ventured to say, having had longer experience of their Lordships' House than the noble Marquess, that the noble Marquess was quite wrong. Any changes made in a Bill after it had been introduced into the House of Commons might be alluded to in their Lordships' House for the reason that a copy of the Bill was in the Library of the House. Therefore, there was no need for the great reticence displayed by the noble Marquess. But what was more important than that was, What was the real meaning of this clause? He understood the noble Marquess to say the previous night that the clause as it originally stood in the Bill laid down that the valuation was to be taken as from the date when the Bill became law. The amended words which had been inserted were, he understood, for the purpose of indicating that the valuation should be taken as at the time when the licence was refused, but upon the basis of what would have been the value of the licence under the system which it was now proposed to alter. The two things were totally different. One could easily be done, and, as his noble and learned friend Lord Coleridge stated the other night, had been done, though the noble Lord opposite thought it could not be done. There was a Return in existence, and the value was there; but, if they were going to take the valuation upon the supposition that the existing Act was in force, but upon a state of things existing six or seven years hence, there was no telling how much that valuation might have increased, and, therefore, to what extent the compensation money would be augmented. He believed the original intention of the Government was as stated by Mr. Lyttelton, and they had not been told why the original intention was abandoned and a new system set up.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Though the noble Marquess has very properly told your Lordship that Bills as introduced in the House of Commons are to be found in the Library yet he has not given himself the trouble to go into the Library and read this Bill as it was introduced. If he had taken that elementary step he would have found that the meaning of the Bill as originally introduced was the same on this point as now, though it was not so well expressed. A considerable change in the drafting has no doubt taken place, but if the noble Marquess will look at the Bill as introduced he will find that the words were then, that the valuation was, to be a sum equal to the difference between the value of the licensed premises, calculated as if this Act had not passed, and the value which those premises would bear if they were not licensed premises. And the intention of the Government when the Bill was drafted was precisely what it is to-day. The noble Marquess also said that it was proved that the suggestion made by the noble and learned Lord yesterday was a perfectly possible and reasonable suggestion, because your Lordships hold in your hands a Return which gives the value of licensed premises. I am not quite sure how far it is right for me to discuss the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord, seeing that it has been considered and rejected; but I feel that if I follow the example of the noble Marquess, who is so experienced a Member of your Lordships' House, I cannot go wrong. Therefore, may I be allowed to say this: that the Return which has been presented to your Lordships deals with the value of the premises as they are licensed now, but not as they would be without licences, which is a very different thing. To obtain the value of them as they would be without licences would be a most elaborate and almost portentous project. It can be done in regard to individual houses coming up for consideration under the operation of this Act where brewster sessions recommend that the licence be suppressed, and quarter sessions agree to that course; but to go into all the licensed houses now and calculate what their value would be unlicensed would necessitate a general valuation of licensed premises throughout the country. There are 100,000 licensed houses, roughly speaking, in the country. It would, I suggest, cost £5 to value each house, and that would bring the total cost up to £500,000. Where is that £500,000 to come from? Is it to come out of the Exchequer or out of the compensation fund? I mention these figures to show that the suggestion which has been made is a most unreasonable one.

LORD COLERIDGE thought the difficulty arose through persons believing that the original words in the Bill were—

"Calculated as if the Act had not passed."

That was very different from taking a valuation as it stood at the time of the passing of the Act. That was never contemplated, he quite agreed. The words that had since been introduced did not seem to him to do more than to make that clear.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

LORD COLERIDGE moved the addition of a proviso at the end of the first subsection which, he said, involved the same principle as the Amendment moved by Earl Grey. In a case where the withdrawal of one licence would increase the value of another licence belonging to the same man it was surely unfair that compensation should be paid for such increased value. If the noble Marquess in considering this matter felt any difficulty about the principle and how to assess it, and would look at the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, Section 38, Sub-section 8, he would see that, in the case of obstructive buildings, where a building was pulled down and compensated for, and where the pulling down of that building increased the rateable value of other buildings, there were provisions for the assessing of those other buildings at an improved rate. Therefore, there was a precedent for this, and he hoped the noble Marquess would give the point his attention.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'deducting from the sum payable by way of compensation to each person or persons so interested as aforesaid respectively, any increased value attaching to any other licensed premises in which such person or persons are interested respectively, and accruing to such person or persons respectively in consequence of the refusal to renew the licence.'"—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I will consider it; but I would point out that in the case which the noble and learned Lord has put the other houses do not pay any contribution.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY reminded the noble Marquess of another illustration in which a set-off was allowed. In connection with the great Shaftesbury Avenue and other improvements there was important property in St. Martin's Lane where the frontage was taken and where the background of the same owner became frontage. It was held that the owner was not entitled to get compensation on the land as if it was totally taken, but was to be debited with the increased value of the land which was back land and which became frontage.

***The LORD BISHOP of ST. ALBANS** said that licensed premises were, as a rule, in few hands, and there were many cases in which the same brewery company owned public-houses close to each other. It was absolutely certain that when one house was suppressed the other houses in the neighbourhood would have a considerable proportion of that trade. He did not say the whole of it, because he believed there would be some reduction in the amount of alcoholic liquor consumed; but a considerable portion of the trade would go to the other houses; and more than that, it would go to the other houses with a very slight additional expense of management. The magistrates hereafter would be able to ascertain precisely what was a fair basis of compensation, and the result of the Amendment would be that the magistrates would be able to reduce a considerably larger number of houses.

The Earl of CREWE pressed upon His Majesty's Government the consideration of this Amendment. His contention and that of other noble Lords on the Opposition side of the House that compensation was not legally due but only morally due, was admitted by the noble Marquess. If it were a question of a legal debt it clearly ought to be paid in due proportion to everybody who claimed, but if it were merely a moral debt to the owners of licences it surely was reasonable that it should be allotted on the merits of the case and not according to strict rule.

Lord DAVEY agreed that the object of the Government in altering the drafting of the clause had been to make clear the meaning which it had when it was originally introduced, but he did not think they had succeeded. In valuing the licensed premises at the time when the compensation had to be paid, they would value them as they were at that date with this exception—and how any valuer was going to do it he did not know, but that was another thing—that they must suppose that the conditions of renewal as regarded that licence were the same as those which now applied. But in the meantime, as the right rev. Prelate had pointed out, other licences in the same town or in the same district would have been extinguished, the consequence of which would be that the value of the licensed premises would be enhanced to a considerable extent. He understood, when he originally read the Bill, that they were to have regard to what the licensed premises would have been worth in 1904. In that case the licensed houses the extinction of which would have enhanced the value of the remaining houses would not have been extinguished, and therefore, the value of the premises would not have been so enhanced. He agreed that it was very difficult to hit upon any form of words which would carry out what he thought was the intention of the Bill and would, at the same time, be easy to work.

As the provision at present stood a valuer, it might be twenty years hence, would have to enter into an historical inquiry as to what the value of the premises was on the conditions of renewal at the date of the passing of this Act. It seemed to him that that was a difficult task to impose on a valuer, and one of a rather speculative character, and he would not be surprised if it led to a certain amount of litigation.

THE EARL OF **LYTTON** asked for an answer to this Question—If an increased value attached to a house by reason of the suppression of another house, would the contribution to the compensation fund be larger because of that increased value? and, if so, would that be taken into consideration when the compensation was paid?

LORD **STANLEY** OF **ALDERLEY** asked what steps it was proposed to take if the owner or other person interested in the licence was to have the full benefit of any increased value, year by year, to get an increased contribution year by year.

THE MARQUESS OF **SALISBURY**: It is perfectly correct that, if there is an increased value of any considerable amount to the remaining houses, it will affect the charges in the schedule to the Bill. The valuation of the house will rise as it gets more valuable, and it will be liable to pay increased charges, or *vice versa*. I am not sorry that the noble Lord has called attention to this, because it does illustrate one of the immense perplexities of the problem with which we are dealing. If there is an increment of value by the suppression of one house, then there will also be an increment of the annual charge within certain limits.

LORD **COLERIDGE** wished to point out how that would work. Let them take, say, four houses rated at £100 each. They would contribute each £20. One of those houses, or, say, two, were abolished, and the rateable value of the two remaining was increased 50 per cent. The two remaining houses would then be assessed at £150 each instead of £100, but neither of them would pay a penny more in compensation.

EARL **SPENCER**: I would suggest that the discussion on this Amendment should be postponed until the Report stage.

THE EARL OF **ROSEBERY**: May I offer one practical suggestion to His Majesty's Government? The noble Marquess has said that he is deterred by the vast cost from making a valuation of licensed premises. To many of us that seems a very grave statement, because, of course, the value of these houses will go on increasing until compensation will almost become prohibitive in scale. A sum of £500,000 is a large one, but I am not sure that it would not be well spent in the way the noble Lord suggests. Will the Government consider the propriety of giving an option to any local authority within a certain number of years, say two or three, to have a valuation of the licensed premises within their jurisdiction made at their own expense? There may be many local authorities which would wish to have that done, and which would feel seriously aggrieved by the refusal of the Government to consider it. I do not ask for an immediate answer, but that the noble Marquess will consider it.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

THE EARL OF **ARRAN** moved to add, at the end of the first sub-section, a proviso to the effect that in estimating the value of the licensed premises there should not be included as an element of value the value of the exclusive right of supplying intoxicating liquors for sale on the licensed premises. The object of the Amendment, he said, was to secure that when a tied house was refused the renewal of its licence under the provisions of the Bill, in assessing the value for compensation no addition should be allowed for the fact that its value might be greater because it was a tied house. There could be no doubt that when such a case occurred, and when claims were made for compensation, it would be contended that a tied house was of more value to the owners and the persons interested, because it was an exclusive channel for the sale of the liquor of that particular firm of brewers, and also because of the double profit that accrued from the sale, first of all, of the beer to the public-house, and, secondly, from the sale to the consumer. There was nothing in the Bill as it at present stood to show that there was any intention that in estimating the value of the licensed premises, the value of a house as a tied house should be included, but, on the other hand, there was nothing in the Bill which said that this valuation should not be allowed. He ventured to suggest to His Majesty's Government that this should be definitely settled one way or the other, and he hoped the Government would settle it in the way proposed in his Amendment. He did not propose to enter into the difficult subject of tied houses, which had been dealt with the previous day, but he ventured to say that the question as to whether the tied-house system was for the advantage of the country or not was an open one, and up to now the members of the trade under the tied-house system had not shown that they were entitled to receive more favourable conditions of compensation than the more humble members of the trade who owned their own houses.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word premises, to insert the words 'Provided always, that in estimating the value of the licensed premises, there shall not be included as an element of value the value of the exclusive right of supplying intoxicating liquors for sale on the licensed premises.' "—(*The Earl of Arran.*)

Earl BEAUCHAMP supported the Amendment on the ground that it would place public trusts and private individuals on an equal footing with brewery companies when they purchased public-houses.

Lord BELPER: I understand that the Amendment is intended to exclude from the assessment for compensation any value which attaches to the house as an outlet for trade. Under the Bill a brewery company owning a house would not get compensation for the loss of a house as an outlet for trade. But the fact that a house may be of more value for a particular reason to a particular person must and will be considered in the valuation. It would be difficult to eliminate any value of that sort. The value of a house goes up because there are different reasons why different people want to buy it, and that fixes more or less the value of the house. Therefore, you cannot entirely eliminate the element that a brewer buys the house for the purpose of getting an outlet for his trade. It is perfectly evident that if you are to fix the value in the way proposed, consideration must be given to all the elements which would induce different buyers to purchase. With regard to the valuation which is made, I think the House may trust the Inland Revenue authorities to put the proper value on a house, and not to place upon it an inflated value. I know that many of these houses have reached, under competition, a value far above what they can possibly bear at a proper valuation, and that this is the case is patent from the fact that even in the last few years many of the purchasers on those terms have found that they have made very bad bargains, and that the houses are worth nothing like the price that under competition they have been obliged to give for them. That is why I say the Inland Revenue authorities can be trusted to put a proper value upon them; but, obviously, the fact that the house may be used by the brewer as an outlet for his trade will be in most cases an element in the valuation.

Lord BURGHCLERE said this raised the important subject which he had endeavoured to raise the previous night on the Earl of Wemyss's Amendment to add "market" before "value," and on that occasion he received an assurance from the Government——

Lord BELPER: I beg the noble Lord's pardon. I gave no assurance. I only made the statement that "value" was, in our opinion, the same as "market value," and that it was unnecessary to put in the word "market" because it was made clear under the Finance Act that the word "value" covered the words the noble Lord wished inserted.

Lord BURGHCLERE said they now knew for the first time that it was the intention of the Government, not only to compensate the retailer, but also to compensate the brewer for the loss of a licensed house, for its additional value as a tied house, and for the curtailment of the sale of his beer owing to the suppression of the house. If that was so, they would considerably limit the amount of the compensation fund available for the reduction of redundant licences. There was this further injustice, that a man who owned his own house, but did not brew his own ale, would have a charge levied upon him to compensate the big brewing companies because they had suffered a loss in their tied houses, or because they did not brew so much ale as formerly owing to a number of tied houses having been suppressed.

LORD BELPER : That is not the intention of the Government.

LORD BURGHCLERE said in that case he hoped the Government would accept an Amendment which he would move at a later stage in order to make the matter perfectly clear.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (The Earl of ONSLOW) : This discussion seems to be based on the supposition that the compensation is to be in the nature of a compensation to be paid by a public authority for the expropriation of an individual from his property. It is not that at all. It is a compulsory compensation fund, and the amount of the contribution to that fund is fixed upon the value of the house. If the value of the house is inflated by reason of its being a tied house, the levy will be proportionately increased ; but it would be manifestly unfair to ask the owners of these houses to pay the levy upon a certain value, and then to say that they shall be compensated on a less or inferior value. It is perfectly obvious that if you are to have a levy in the nature of an insurance fund you must fix it on the value which the house would be likely to fetch in the open market. There may be two or more brewers competing for a particular house, but its price is the market value of the house. It is preposterous to suppose that you can, in an insurance scheme, eliminate certain qualifications of value from these houses because they happen to be an outlet for the manufactures of brewery companies. These houses are valued constantly by the Inland Revenue authorities for the purposes of death duties ; the value is based on what the houses would fetch in the open market, and it is on that basis that the Bill lays down that the levy shall be fixed and the compensation paid.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said that until this discussion arose it had never occurred to him that the phrase "persons interested" was intended to include persons who supplied beer.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW : The compensation is fixed on the basis of the value of the house. It has nothing whatever to do with persons behind who may have an interest in the supply of beer.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN thought it was desirable to have in the Bill some definition of the persons interested. The noble Lord who had moved the Amendment imagined, apparently erroneously, that the brewer who owned the house would be compensated, not only as the owner of the house, which was perfectly right, but also as a person who supplied beer which would no longer be wanted. If that definition was right they ought to go further ; they ought to go on to the hop-grower and say that he, too, was an interested person, because he used to grow hops which, owing to the abolition of the house and the reduction in the amount of beer consumed, would no longer be wanted. The discussion appeared to him to prove the desirability of inserting in the Bill some definition of the persons interested, so as to make it clear that they were only those persons interested in the house and in the sale of beer in the house.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY) : It seems to me that the clause is perfectly plain. The value of the house is that which has got to be assessed, and in what proportion and to what degree other persons may be interested is a totally different question.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

LORD BURGHCLERE then moved the Amendment which he had indicated his intention of moving in order to make the matter perfectly clear.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'but in calculating such compensation no account shall be taken of any profits arising from the manufacture, as distinct from the sale by retail, of intoxicating liquors, nor from the sale by wholesale of such liquors.' "—(*Lord Burghclere.*)

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 42; Not-Contents, 112.

CONTENTS.

Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Buckinghamshire, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.
Temple, E.

Cobham, V.

Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)
Peel, V.

Bath and Wells, L. Bp.
Chester, L. Bp.
Durham, L. Bp.
Hereford, L. Bp.
Lichfield, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.

Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L.
Davey, L.

Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Farrer, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Monkswell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Sandhurst, L.
Sherborne, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Thring, L.
Welby, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Argyll, D.
Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain*)
Bathurst, E.
Bradford, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chichester, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Derby, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Drogheda, E.
Eldon, E.
Essex, E.
Feversham, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Lathom, E.

Leven and Melville, E.
Londesborough, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Lytton, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Halifax, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Biddulph, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.

Crawshaw, L.
Deramore, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)
Forester, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Glanusk, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hylton, L.
James, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Methuen, L.
Newton, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Raglan, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Rossmore, L.
Rothschild, L.
Sinclair, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Teynham, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY moved an Amendment to provide that the compensation, instead of being ascertained by the Inland Revenue Commissioners as if valued for estate duty, should bear a definite ratio to the contribution made by the licence-holder to the compensation fund. He said that, as a rule, from eight-tenths to nine-tenths of these houses never came under the death duties at all, because they belonged to limited companies. The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture had said that it would be most unjust to make them pay the levy at one rate and to compensate them at a less rate. He presumed the noble Earl would agree that it would be equally unjust that they should pay a levy at one rate and be compensated at another and a higher rate. His desire was to secure fair play for the various people contributing to the fund. He quite agreed that if he struck out the provision of the Bill as proposed, words would be needed to set up a basis of value; but he suggested that that basis of value might very well be found by adopting the schedule upon which they paid, and taking so many years purchase on that schedule.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word 'paid' to the word 'shall' in line 18.'"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think the noble Lord will see that his Amendment is quite impossible. I think when he put it down he intended it to be consequential on the other Amendment. The other Amendment has been rejected, and it is quite impossible to take the consequential Amendment, as there would then be no means of ascertaining what the amount was.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: Not without further words.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The Government could not assent to an Amendment of this kind unless they saw the further words. But the further words which the noble Lord adumbrated would not be consistent with the first sub-section of this clause, which has already passed.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend Sub-section 2, which provided that, in the case of the licence-holder, regard should be had, not only to his legal interest in the premises, but also to his conduct and to the length of time during which he had been the holder of 'the" licence. The noble Earl moved to substitute "a" for the word "the." The object of the Amendment was that licence-holders should be compensated for the full term during which they had been licence-holders and not for the term during which they might have held the particular licence in question. He thought it was distinctly to the advantage of the public that these houses should be managed by people who had had previous experience in managing smaller houses. In the event of the licence of a large public-house not being renewed, the licence-holder under the Bill would only receive compensation for the time he had held the licence of the larger house, and would not receive any compensation in respect of the longer period spent in smaller houses. The object of the Amendment was to encourage people who had succeeded well in managing small public-houses to undertake the management of larger ones. If there were any other words which would better meet the case, he would be glad to accept them from noble Lords opposite.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 24, to leave out the first word 'the' and insert the word 'a.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

***THE EARL OF ONSLOW**: The Amendment of the noble Earl though it has an appearance of great innocence, covers a wide ground. The noble Earl is anxious to encourage the professional public-house keeper, and to say that he should be specially compensated if he has conducted public-houses all his life in an exemplary manner. That really is going a very long way. I confess I think the Bill already goes very far in saying you shall give compensation to a man who has been disturbed in his business; but now the noble Earl asks us to say that any man who has conducted any public-house well and for a long period of years shall receive special compensation when the licence of a particular house is abolished. I think that is going beyond the bounds of all reason, and I am sorry I cannot accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved an Amendment with the view of securing to the tenant on the division of the compensation money the value of his fixtures. He said that in the case of any other trade emoved for public purposes and compensated, the tenant was able to use his fixtures again wherever he happened to go, but in the event of a licence not being renewed on the ground probably that there were too many public-houses the various fixtures would be no longer needed. An auctioneer coming in and selling them would not succeed in getting anything like their proper value, and the object of his Amendment was to compensate the licence-holder, whose property the fixtures generally were. The Amendment would not have the effect of increasing the amount of compensation which would be paid. The question was the division of the compensation between the various parties interested, and therefore the Amendment would in no way increase the charge on the compensation fund, whilst it would ensure that the licence-holder was paid for the fixtures which would probably be entirely lost when a house was suppressed.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 24, after the first word 'licence' to insert the words 'and to the diminution in value consequent on the non-renewal of the licence of any trade fixtures or any other property owned by him and used for the purposes of his business as a licence-holder.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I venture to think that the intention of this Amendment is in the direction of the spirit of the Bill, and, so far as I read the Bill, it is covered by the provisions made for the division of the compensation money among the different parties interested. The noble Lord thinks otherwise. I am, of course, anxious to give to the Bill that character which the Government intended, but there is always the legal difficulty that if you specify certain things that are to be taken into consideration, the presumption is that you meant to exclude certain other things. I think there are a great many more matters for consideration in dividing the compensation, besides the question of the tenants' trade fixtures. If the noble Earl will postpone his Amendment, I will promise to consider between now and the Report stage whether the trade fixtures are not properly part of the interest entitled to compensation which quarter sessions would have to take into consideration in assessing the various interests.

LORD DAVEY expressed his satisfaction that the noble Earl had regarded the Amendment with a favourable eye. He thought the Government would find, on looking into the matter, that trade fixtures were not properly part of the interest entitled to compensation as the Bill was now framed. The compensation was only for the premises, and trade fixtures were not part of the premises. They were removable by the tenant and were his personal property, and therefore some words would be required to be placed in the Bill if the valuer was to be enabled to take trade fixtures into account.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said that in the circumstances, and on the understanding that the Government would look into the matter, he would withdraw his Amendment at this stage.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I have an Amendment to move in the provision that—

"The holder of a licence, if a tenant, shall, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, in no case receive a less amount than he would be entitled to as tenant for a year, or from year to year, of the licensed premises."

I move to insert after the word "as" the words "a yearly," and to leave out the words "or a year, or from year to year." It will then read that he should in no case receive a less amount that he would be entitled to as a yearly tenant. The meaning is the same, but the Amendment is better drafting.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'as' to insert the words 'a yearly'; and in lines 26 and 27, to leave out the words 'for a year or from year to year.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

LORD DAVEY said a tenant for a year and a tenant from year to year were quite different. He assumed that the words "a yearly tenant" meant a tenant from year to year. It certainly could not mean both. "A yearly tenant" did not convey any exact legal meaning.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The words "a yearly" are intended to cover both alternatives.

LORD DAVEY said they certainly did not cover both.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: If the noble and learned Lord thinks they do not, I will not press the Amendment now, but will bring it up on Report.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is of a drafting character. The intention of it is to make clear the meaning of Sub-section 3, which reads—

"If on the division of the amount to be paid as compensation any question arises which quarter sessions consider should be referred to the determination of a Court, they may refer that question to the County Court in accordance with the rules of Court to be made for the purpose."

The words as they stand have the effect of practically implying that quarter sessions is not a Court. That was not intended. The phrase used in the Amendment is more suitable, and I hope the House will allow me to substitute it.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 29 and 30, to leave out the words 'should be referred to the determination of a' and insert the words 'can be more conveniently determined by the county.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS moved, on behalf of the Earl of Rosslyn, to add at the end of the sub-section which had just been amended, the words "or may state a case for the consideration of the High Court."

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 32, after the word 'purpose' to insert the words 'or may state a case for the consideration of the High Court.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I hope your Lordships will not accept this Amendment, which appears to me to be very undesirable. The County Court is quite competent to deal with such questions, and can deal with them simultaneously all over the country, if necessary. I do not think it is at all desirable to use the High Court, which has quite enough to do already, to perform this sort of function. I hope your Lordships will not accept the Amendment.

LORD DAVEY asked the noble and learned Earl, the Lord Chancellor whether, in his view, as the sub-section had been amended, there would be an appeal from the County Court.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: No.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

EARL GREY moved to insert a new sub-section providing that for the purpose of calculating the value of licensed premises under this section occupiers of all licensed premises to which the Act applied should once in every month make a return to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue showing the amount of alcoholic liquor sold on the premises during the preceding month. He said that under the law as it stood at present a licence-holder was obliged to make a return of the amount of spirits consumed on his premises, but not of the beer and wines. There would be no more difficulty in making a return of all the liquors. Whenever a new public-house trust company was formed they were flooded with suggestions that they should buy up unremunerative houses. Their first step was to find out the amount of all the liquors consumed in the house, and so get at its gross revenue. Then it was easy to ascertain the net revenue, and from that the number of years purchase that should be given for it. He held that it was very desirable, in the interests of future legislation, that the normal amount of business done by a house should be easily ascertained.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 32, after the word 'purpose," to insert as a new sub-section the words:

"(4.) For the purpose of calculating the value of licensed premises under this section, occupiers of all licensed premises to which this Act applies shall once in every month make a return to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue at such time and in such form as the Commissioners determine, showing the amount of alcoholic liquor sold on the premises during the preceding month."—(*Earl Grey.*)

***THE EARL OF CARLISLE** said there was a precedent for this proposal in Lord Kitchener's regulations for the sale of liquor in Khartoum, in which it was required that a weekly return should be made. He understood that this had been productive of most excellent results in enabling the authorities to know how the sale of liquor was proceeding.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am afraid I cannot say what the regulations established by Lord Kitchener in Khartoum may be. I have no doubt they are adequate; but I do not think the noble Lord is correct in saying that such returns could be demanded under the present law on renewal. One objection to this Amendment is that it is inconsistent with the proposal made by the noble Earl last night, that the compensation should depend on the value of the premises before the passing of this Bill.

EARL GREY: But I was not fortunate enough to get my Amendment accepted last night.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: If I understand that my noble friend has abandoned the other proposal, that objection would fall to the ground; but another objection, and a stil more important one, is that the Amendment is inconsistent with the plan of His Majesty's Government. The noble Earl begins his Amendment with these words, "For the purpose of calculating the value of licensed premises under this section——"

EARL GREY: I will gladly strike out those words. They are quite unnecessary to the Amendment.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: By the words we have already passed we have enacted that the method shall be to take precisely the difference in value between a house as it stands with its licence and the value of the house as it would stand without a licence. It does not follow that the returns of what is drunk on the premises would correspond with the value so laid down. For example, a public-house might be held by a professional cricketer, whose celebrity in the locality might largely increase the amount of beer drunk on the premises, but the enhanced value would be due to the cricketer's reputation, which he would carry away with him if he removed to other premises, and I do not think that should be a matter for compensation. We are of opinion that the quantity of liquor sold is not a proper criterion. I cannot accept the Amendment.

EARL SPENCER: I would suggest to the noble Earl that he should postpone his Amendment until the Report stage, when he would know the fate of his main Amendment.

EARL GREY, acting on this suggestion, withdrew his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3:

***THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON** moved an Amendment to omit the words "not exceeding, and" in the first sub-section, so that the maximum charge levied might exceed £100. The Home Secretary had originally held out the hope that the maximum rate would be £150, but when the Bill was printed the amount fixed by the schedule was £100. If these words were removed each quarter sessions would be left to work out its own salvation in its own county, having local knowledge. There were not a few who had privately expressed their surprise that it was possible to assert, as he did in the course of his speech on the Second Reading, that only 1,855 houses in London would be closed under the Bill, whereas 2,038 would be closed without it. He thought it was due to the House to explain on what that estimate was based. The Parliamentary Committee of the London County Council had said that £3,000 would be the average cost of closing each house in London. They had been promised that 25 per cent. of the houses would be suppressed in the first year, which would cost £5,565,000 borrowing at 4 per cent. The levies of London, according to the last reckoning, would be £250,000 a year. To acquire that sum would require forty-eight years of those levies. If they divided £3,000 into £5,565,000 it gave 1,855. Then in thirteen years 552 houses had been suppressed, and at that rate in forty-eight years 2,038 would be suppressed without the operation of any Bill. If, instead of borrowing £5,565,000, they spent £250,000 annually, which would, at first, close eighty-three or eighty-four houses a year, it would be far more expensive. As time went on the remaining houses would increase in value and £250,000 might suffice only to reduce forty houses a year. It was said he had not taken into account the number of houses closed for other reasons than those contemplated in the Bill, but these were covered by the difference between 2,038 and 1,855, and London was the most favourable town they could take for the working of the Bill. In the country it all depended on whether quarter sessions used all their powers in all the counties to raise the sum, and there were varying conditions all over the country. If it were said that the raising of a higher levy would be trampling on the trade, he would remind their Lordships that brewers paid in London £275,000 a year, whereas, if they were taxed on the scale of New York, they would pay £2,600,000 a year. To describe the Amendment as "pillage," therefore, hardly represented the facts.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 37, to leave out the words 'not exceeding and," and in line 38, to leave out the word 'maximum.' "—(*The Lord Bishop of London.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: When I used the word "pillage," in replying to the most rev. Primate, I was pointing out that, although enormous profits have been made in the liquor trade, it by no means followed that the people who would be affected by the Bill would be able to bear a large loss. I quite agree with the right rev. Prelate and his right rev. brethren that Parliament made a very great mistake formerly when it allowed this monopoly value to grow up, but these things are, unfortunately, irrevocable, and they are irrevocable because public-house shares have changed hands and the present owner may have had no share in the large profits. The persons who make the large profits go beyond the power of your Lordships' arm to reach them. They retire with the fortune they have made, which they very likely invest in American securities, or in some other advantageous investment. The people you have to deal with now are not persons who are making enormous profit in many cases, or in most cases, but persons who are just as rich and as poor as other persons. They have made investments relying on the laws of the country, and we say they are entitled to protection. The right rev. Prelate says that, notwithstanding this, we might very properly increase the duty that is levied on the liquor trade. He may be right. It will always be open to the other House of Parliament to increase the duty on the liquor trade if they think it right and fair and proper, and nothing in this Bill will prevent that or be inconsistent with it. If in any future session Parliament thinks it right to increase the compensation fund by further levies it will be open for them to do so. I do not say whether the House of Commons would be right or wrong in doing that; I pronounce no opinion on the subject; but there is nothing in the Bill which would be inconsistent with that, supposing it should recommend itself to the representatives of the people. The right rev. Prelate's Amendment does not propose that there should be an unlimited power of taxing the liquor trade by the representatives of the people, but that this unlimited power should be entrusted to quarter sessions. I cannot believe that your Lordships would agree to such a proposal. I ask noble Lords on the other side of the House whether they are really prepared to confer upon a nominated, not an elected, body an unlimited power of axing a particular trade in this country.

I think the proposition only requires to be stated for it to be shown that the thing is quite impossible. I do not believe there is a single one of your Lordships who would approve of such a power being given to quarter sessions. I am sure there is no noble Lord sitting opposite me who would, according to his principles, entertain it for a moment. I do not agree with the right rev. Prelate in despising the effect in London of this Bill as it stands. £252,000 a year is, after all, a very considerable figure, and, if that sum were divided by a reasonable figure representing the average compensation in the early years of the operation of the Bill, I think it would be found that a very large number of public-houses might be suppressed. The right rev. Prelate has given £3,000 as the average value of a licence. I am afraid I must demur to that figure.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON said the Parliamentary Committee of the County Council fixed that figure.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think the right rev. Prelate will probably find that the Parliamentary Committee of the London County Council were contemplating quite a different thing from what we are contemplating at the moment under this Bill. They were thinking of the average value of licensed premises when they were contemplating their suppression for the purpose of public improvements—good, bad, and indifferent, small and large, rich and poor. We are not undertaking that in this Bill. What we hope the operation of the Bill will be is that the renewal of the licences of the bad houses, which are not the large and rich ones, but the very small and poor houses, will be arrested. The compensation money, therefore, will go a great deal further than was contemplated by the County Council. The Parliamentary Committee also had to consider, in fixing their figure, the enhanced prices which compulsory expropriation always carries with it, and they had to deal with the different interests separately instead of dealing with them all together as provided in the Bill. For all these reasons I think the right rev. Prelate will find that his calculation is not to be relied upon, although I am certain he gave it in absolute good faith. I think the Bill will be far more effective than the right rev. Prelate thinks. He stated that my noble friends were wrong on a previous occasion when they said that the figures he gave of licences which had been suppressed had reference to those which were suppressed for misconduct and such reasons, and he declared that the reasons for which they were suppressed were in a large number of cases precisely those contemplated by the Bill. Before I assented to that proposition I should like to see the reasons for which these houses were suppressed under the existing law. I venture, with great submission, to doubt whether they were, in fact, suppressed for uch reasons as this Bill contemplates as entitling a house which is suppressed to receive compensation. Lastly, the right rev. Prelate says the total figure of £1,250,000 is altogether illusory because quarter sessions are not compelled to raise all the charges which go to make up that sum. That is perfectly true; but that observation cuts both ways and affects the Amendment also. For all these reasons, but principally, of course, because it would be quite impossible to give quarter sessions the power proposed by the Amendment, the Government cannot accept it.

EARL CARRINGTON said the noble Marquess was perfectly correct in stating that the licences abolished by the County Council in connection with the improvements which they affected cost more in the matter of compensation than houses would obtain which were abolished under this Bill. He mentioned that the County Council had done away, in all, with £315,000 worth of public-house property, which he thought compared very favourably with the achievement of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who justly boasted that they had suppressed £300,000 worth of licensed houses on their property. In some of our own Colonies, and also in the United States, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark the sale of intoxicating drink had been restricted over large areas, and in some cases had been restricted altogether, to the great advantage of the people and entirely without compensation. In one case only, namely in the Colony of Victoria, compensation was provided for, with the result that not one single public-house had been shut up throughout the whole of that great and thriving province of the Commonwealth of Australia. Though this Bill had been before the House some days, not one independent Member of their Lordships' House among the supporters of the Government had risen in his place to say a word in its favour.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: That is not so. The Marquess of Bath, Viscount Cross, Lord Lytton, and Earl Stanhope supported the Bill.

EARL CARRINGTON: Lord Lytton did not bless the Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: He spoke in favour of it, and voted for it.

EARL CARRINGTON said it was quite true that Earl Stanhope did support the Bill, and that he expressed the opinion that it would effect a considerable reform and tend greatly to the promotion of temperance. But for himself he could not take that sanguine view. The noble Earl behind him (Earl Grey) had also supported the Bill, but had explained his vote by saying that it was given in lively anticipation of favours to come. He ventured to think that there must be some reason for the silence on the part of the supporters of His Majesty's Government. He thought they were dissatisfied for two reasons. In the first place, they looked with disfavour on the pugnacious attitude which had been adopted on this subject by the trade, who had told the Government that "their trade was their politics," and——

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH): I disclaim any right except that of an individual Peer to suggest that the noble Earl is travelling beyond the Amendment, but I think he will recognise that that is so.

EARL CARRINGTON thereupon resumed his seat.

LORD MONKSWELL expressed hope that the noble Marquess would not prove to be a good prophet when he spoke of only the small houses being bought out. If that were to be the case in the county of London he was afraid it would lead to a very slight decrease in the drink traffic. With regard to what the noble Marquess had said as to the taxation of the trade, he reminded the House that Sir Michael Hicks Beach said only two years ago that the sums obtained for the licences were very inadequate. Sir Michael thought that the amounts ought to be very much larger, and that the money so obtained should go in relief of local taxation. The right hon. Gentleman did not suggest that that extra money belonged to the trade; and he (Lord Monkswell) hoped that future Chancellors of the Exchequer would consider that there was nothing in the Bill to prevent them going a great deal further than the noble Marquess suggested. The noble Marquess had suggested that a future Chancellor of the Exchequer might raise a greater amount of compensation money; but why should he limit himself to that particular increase only? He trusted there was nothing in the Bill which would prevent a Chancellor of the Exchequer saying quite independently of the compensation fund that he would increase the licence duties, and that those licences duties should go in relief of local taxation.

EARL BEAUCHAMP asked whether the Government would increase the scale of maximum charges.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: That cannot be done by your Lordships' House?

On Question, Amendment negatived.

*EARL STANHOPE moved to amend Sub-section 5, which enacted that—

> "Any expenses incurred by quarter sessions in the payment of compensation under this Act, or otherwise in the exercise of their powers or the performance of their duties under this Act, and such expenses of the justices of the licensing district incurred under this Act as quarter sessions may allow, shall be paid out of the compensation fund and quarter sessions in the exercise of their powers under this Act, shall have regard to the funds available for the purpose."

He moved to insert, in the first line, after "expenses" the words "and all necessary legal expenses." He thought the wording of the clause as it at present stood was rather ambiguous, and that it would lead to a rich harvest by lawyers unless it was made quite clear.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'expenses' to insert the words 'and all necessary legal expenses.'"—(*Earl Stanhope.*)

LORD BELPER: I think I can make it clear to my noble friend that his object is better attained by leaving the words as they are. As a matter of fact, we do not wish to encourage the idea that there are going to be large legal expenses, and I do not think there will be. You have the general word "expenses," and if you include one thing you impliedly exclude another; if you put in such words as "legal expenses" it might be very necessary also to put in such matters as the employment of valuers and other purposes for which there will, no doubt, be some expenditure under the Act. I can assure my noble friend that it is better for his purpose to leave the words as they are.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

* **THE EARL OF CARLISLE** moved an Amendment to provide that Section 20 of the Licensing Act, 1902, shall apply as though the consideration of a report of the justices of a licensing district were a case of appeal against their decision. He said he wished to secure that the justices should not be placed in a worse position with regard to costs than they were now. At present their costs were secured to them, but under the Bill they would depend on the will of quarter sessions. By the Alehouse Act of 1828 the justices were allowed to have their costs from the trade in case they succeeded on appeal, but if they lost their case on appeal it depended upon quarter sessions whether they got any costs or not. That left the justices in a state of considerable anxiety, and he believed it was very largely due to this uncertainty as to the recovery of costs that so few licences had been reduced. His Majesty's Government had said it was owing to their inability to pay compensation, but he believed that a very much more potent reason was the fear that they might be mulcted in costs for the action they had taken. The present Government had felt that that was the case apparently, because they inserted a clause in their Act of 1902 which ensured the payment of costs to magistrates out of the county fund in case they lost on appeal. Not only was this done, but a circular was issued from the Home Office drawing the attention of magistrates to this alteration of the law; and he believed it was largely owing to that circular that the action was taken by magistrates in 1903 which had excited so much indignation in certain quarters. However that might be, by the present Bill magistrates were left entirely dependent upon quarter sessions. He thought they would be justified in doubting whether that was a safe security. A case occurred in 1903 where a brewster sessions, for various reasons, refused the renewal of a licence. The appeal went up to quarter sessions and was not allowed, quarter sesions upholding the decision of the magistrates. But they did not allow the magistrates costs, although they had gained the case. If, however, they had lost their case their costs would have been paid for out of the county fund. The appeal went up from quarter sessions to a higher Court, and a *mandamus* was issued compelling the payment of costs to the magistrates but those costs were taxed by the legal officer of the quarter sessions whose decision as to the costs had been overruled, with a result their Lordships could imagine. It would be unsafe for magistrates to trust to the decision of quarter sessions in this matter. He would like to repeat a statement made by Lord Onslow the previous day, that it was the intention of the Government to do nothing to impair the authority and discretion of the local justices, and also that it was their intention to retain the present procedure as far as possible. If that was the intention of the Government, he hoped they would see no objection to introduce the words he proposed.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 23, after the word 'fund' to insert the words 'and Section 20 of the Licensing Act, 1902, shall apply as though the consideration of a report of the justices of a licensing district were a case of appeal against their decision.'"—(*The Earl of Carlisle.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: It is unfortunate that the noble Earl did not convey his wish to Members of the other House of Parliament. I am informed by those who understand these things a great deal better than I do myself that it is not competent under the Constitution for us to insert such an Amendment as the noble Lord has proposed. If the noble Lord looks at the clause in the Act of 1902, he will find that the effect of his Amendment would be to throw an increased charge on the rates, and I am informed that cannot be done by this House. But the noble Lord may make his mind easy. We do provide that such expenses of the justices incurred under this Act as quarter sessions shall allow, shall be paid out of the compensation fund. I do not think that the suspicion which the noble Earl indicated against quarter sessions that they would not act fairly in this matter is really well founded.

*THE EARL OF CARLISLE reminded the noble Marquess that an Amendment of this kind was put down by a supporter of His Majesty's Government in the other House, but it was closured without any opportunity being given for its discussion.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY moved an Amendment to provide that the money borrowed by quarter sessions on the security of the compensation fund should be borrowed "for a period not exceeding seven years." He said he had purposely in the course of these discussions refrained from intervening in matters which seemed to him, though they were questions of the highest possible importance, to be questions of detail on which he was not competent to form an opinion which was of any special value. This, however, was a matter of principle rather than of detail. He viewed with grave apprehension the danger which might arise if the local authorities mortgaged for years to come the money which was to be obtained year by year from the compensation levy. If a local authority borrowed to a large extent and mortgaged the fund for years to come, it would be impossible for their successors to take any action in the way of limiting the number of licences. The Government had more than once spoken of the possibility which existed of future legislation for amending this Bill. The difficulty of legislating would be very great if they found that the compensation fund had been mortgaged for years to come. Therefore he should like to elicit from the Government some concession. He suggested that seven years would be a suitable time, but he was not particular about the exact term of years provided it was not too long. He hoped the Government would consent to some modification of the scheme as it at present stood. He did not think the sanction of the Secretary of State to the loan sufficient security.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 27, after the word 'borrow' to insert the words 'for a period not exceeding seven years.'" — (*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

LORD BELPER: I can assure the House that I entirely sympathise with the remarks of the most rev. Primate as to the importance of not mortgaging the borrowing powers of quarter sessions for too long a period, but this is a matter that will be dealt with under the regulations of the Secretary of State. There would be some difficulty in fixing an absolute limit, because circumstances would vary in different districts. Probably seven years would be too short a period, and personally I think the period might be ten or fourteen years. Such is, I believe, the view of my colleagues, but I hope the assurance will be accepted that the matter will be dealt with by regulation, and that the action that will be taken by the Secretary of State will be in the direction of taking care that the power is not too largely used.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY remarked that an assurance would not pledge future Secretaries of State. He did not understand whether the noble Lord means that the rules that were going to be drawn up were going to contain a provision of this kind, or whether he meant that an Amendment suggesting ten years instead of seven might be accepted by the Government. He would be willing to alter the limit to that extent to meet the Government view.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: We will engage that rules shall contain some such limit, though I think seven years is rather too short. There is an obvious objection to a hard and fast line being drawn in the Act. It is one of the great advantages of rules that they can be modified without coming to Parliament. There is no reason to expect that anyone will play ducks and drakes with this part of the Bill, and the most rev. Primate may trust the Secretary of State in the matter.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY asked whether rules made by the Secretary of State would be as binding as an Act of Parliament, or whether it would be possible to vary them from time to time.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I distinctly stated that the great advantage of rules was that they were elastic anp could be modified.

EARL SPENCER: For my part, I should hesitate to give so much power to the Secretary of State. I would prefer that the clause should contain some indication of the views now expressed, and that the matter should not be left entirely to the discretion of a Secretary of State.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY agreed to withdraw the Amendment, hoping that at a later stage the Government would make a more definite statement.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The first Amendment to this clause is merely a drafting Amendment. The latter words of Sub-section 1, from the word "sessions," in line 36, as they stand in the Bill, only apply to county quarter sessions, but it is of course intended that they should apply similarly to the authority in county boroughs as well as to county quarter sessions. Therefore it is necessary to take out this part of the clause and put words in a little later, when they will apply to both authorities instead of the one.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 36, to leave out from the first word 'sessions' to the end of the sub-section."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is in line 40. This is merely drafting, so that it shall read the grant of a new on-licence. Of course it is only intended to refer to new on-licences.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 40, after the word 'new' to insert the word 'on.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said he had to propose an Amendment to Sub-section 2. That Sub-section ran as follows—

"The justices of a licensing district, on the grant of a new licence, may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions both as to the payments to be made and the tenure of the licence and as to any other matters, as they think proper in the interests of the public; subject as follows."

He proposed here to insert a new Sub-section (a), which would make it absolutely clear and distinct that there should not be in the case of a new licence anything in the nature of an interest which should require compensation. With regard to the Amendment, as he had put it down on the Paper, his attention had been directed, with regard to the first sentence, which ran—

"No charges in respect of the compensation fund shall be imposed on the holder of a new licence,"

to the fact that the Bill only enabled the compensation fund to be levied from the holders of existing on-licences. He recognised the force of that remark, and therefore did not propose to move that part of the Amendment, but he proposed to move the remainder, which would run thus—

"No compensation shall be payable in the event of the renewal of a new licence being refused."

He desired that it should be made as clear as possible that there should be no question of compensation arising with regard to new licences. Their previous experience had been such as to make it essential that they should be precise and distinct in what they said with regard to licences. He observed that a little lower down the noble Marquess himself had an Amendment which provided that the new licences might be annual licences. As Sub-section 3 stood it would be open to the Government to say that a new licence would be a licence for a term. But quite independently of licences for a term it might possibly be a licence for a year, and the noble Marquess by his Amendment recognised that that might be so. Let them have no more mistakes with regard to these annual licences, because the noble Marquess had himself said a little time ago that it was the fault of Parliament that these claims for compensation had become valid. He did not quite agree with the noble Marquess, because he did not know how Parliament could very well state anything more clearly than when they said a licence should be for a year and for a year only. He thought it was rather the practice of the magistrates which subsequently set up a claim for compensation which had now been admitted as valid. But that was not the matter they were on. Do not let it be said that it was the fault of Parliament, or that by what Parliament had done, or omitted, Parliament had made it possible that any such claim could grow up in future with regard to new licences. It was with the object of preventing that that he moved.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 3, after the word "follows" to insert the words '(a) No compensation shall be payable in the event of the renewal of a new licence being refused.' "—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

LORD BELPER: My Lords, the Government are entirely in sympathy with the views of my noble friend, but we do think that the Bill as it stands practically makes it clear that no compensation can apply to any new licences. Both in Clause 3 and Clause 4 the power to impose charges with regard to compensation is strictly limited to the existing on-licences, and the scheme of the Bill with regard to new licences is entirely different. With regard to them there is no compensation fund, there will be no compensation charge, and there can be no claim for compensation. But the way the Bill proposes to deal with new licences is to give the magistrates very wide powers with regard to the conditions they shall impose—either pecuniary conditions or conditions under which the house shall be managed. But there is no suggestion that there is anything like compensation with regard to them, and the words which confine the compensation fund to existing on-licences directly point out that it could not apply to new licences. In asking my noble friend not to press the Amendment it is not because we at all disagree with him, but because we think his object is already attained in the Bill.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: With regard to the existing annual licences there is nothing anywhere which shows that they are entitled to compensation on account of non-renewal and yet, as you know, they are all to be compensated.

EARL BELPER: The opening words of Section 1 clearly relate to the power to refuse the renewal of an existing on-licence.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said that mistakes had been made. He was speaking of existing licences which they were now going to compensate for all time under this Bill. There was nothing in the existing law which said they were entitled to compensation if not renewed, but as a matter of fact they knew they were all to be compensated. It might prove the same with regard to these new licences. The noble Lord, Lord Belper, said there was no question of compensation, but there was nothing in the Bill to say they were not to have compensation.

LORD BELPER: It is limited to existing on-licences.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN remarked that the compensation might not come out of the compensation fund. Would it not be possible for the holders of the new licences, especially if they were yearly licences, to argue hereafter, " We were given a licence and held it from year to year, and we claim that owing to the practice of continuing our licences for many years we have acquired a claim to compensation. Look how you dealt with the case of licences which existed before the passing of this Act ?" He vested the claim for his Amendment and his desire to enforce it very much on what the noble Marquess said regarding Parliament being remiss and not having clearly stated what it meant with regard to licences. He hoped their Lordships would not in future allow any possibility of a similar claim being made.

The Question having been proposed,

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN said he would not put their Lordships to the trouble of a division, and would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: The object of the next Amendment is this. It appeared necessary when this clause was drafted to allow so much profit to be reserved to the licensee as not to interfere with the prospect of good management. Of course all your Lordships would approve of that. But our attention has been called to the fact that good management does not include suitable premises, and it appeared necessary to make that point clear, and therefore I move this Amendment.

Amendment moved—

" In page 4, line 5, after the word 'for' to insert the words 'suitable premises and.' "—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: The next Amendment, my Lords, is pure drafting.

Amendment moved—

" In page 4, line 9, to leave out the word 'as' and insert the word 'when,' and to leave out the word 'premises.' " — (*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord COLERIDGE submitted an Amendment which he hoped the Government would consider favourably. It was to provide that the local authorities should have the power, by notice given to them, of appearing before the justices before a new licence was granted. A new licence might make a difference to rating. Everybody knew that the increase of public-houses did tend to increase crime, poverty, lunacy, and other things that tended to raise the rates. It seemed to him a reasonable Amendment and one which the noble Marquess might accept.

Amendment moved—

" In page 4, line 18, after the word 'value' to insert the words 'Provided that no new licence shall be granted until at least three weeks notice shall have been given to the local authority for the area in which such premises are situate, and the justices have considered all representations made by such local authority either in writing or at the hearing of the application in respect of such application.' " (*Lord Coleridge.*)

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I do not know whether the noble and learned Lord is aware of what the provisions of the law are already. There must be twenty-one days notice to the overseers; twenty-one days notice to the police; and twenty-eight days notice put on the church doors and other public places. Therefore, my Lords, there is ample notice given of the proposed granting of a new licence. Anyone, of course, is entitled to communicate with the licensing justices, and I need not say that the local authority is entitled so to communicate. I notice, by the way, that the noble and learned Lord does not say which local authority he is thinking of.

Lord COLERIDGE: I thought that would come in better in the interpretation clause at the end, and I have drafted an Amendment for that purpose.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: That is not very material. On the whole.

we think that it would be a pity to accept this Amendment. It would seem to imply that we wanted the local authority to perpetually take action in matters of this kind. That will cause one inevitable result, namely, that the liquor question will become an issue at every county council or district council election in consequence of the Amendment. I cannot help thinking that most of your Lordships engaged in county government would regret that being the case unless you were going to give substantial power to the local authorities. Although I should not agree with it, it might be very well from your point of view. It is unnecessary to give them the power of communicating expressly with the magistrates when they have the power, like everybody else, already, and thereby to import the liquor issue into every local authority election. I hope the Amendment will not be pressed.

LORD COLERIDGE intimated that he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: From the Bill as it has come up from another place it is just possible that the public and the magistrates might draw the conclusion that it is intended that a new licence should always be a seven-year licence. That is not the intention of His Majesty's Government. I do not think such a mistake ought properly to be made because I do not think the words are capable of that misconstruction, but in order to make it abundantly clear that the seven-years licence is not intended to be the only form which a new licence may take after the passing of the Act, we propose this slight change in the words which makes it quite clear. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 19, to leave out the words from the beginning of the sub-section to the word 'for' in line 20, and insert the words 'The justices of a licensing district may, if they think fit, instead of granting a new on-licence as an annual licence grant the licence.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

EARL CARRINGTON inquired whether the new annual licences would come under the conditions of ordinary existing licences with regard to compensation and extinction.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: No.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said that as the Amendment was drafted it looked as if the alternative was to give a licence for one year or for seven years. It seemed to him it might be thought that if a man was going to the expense of fitting up the premises in a particular way, he should have the expectation of a few years: three, four, or five, as the case might be. He inquired whether it was intended that the magistrates should have the power to give a licence for any term between one year and seven years, as the words seemed to suggest it must be for either one year or seven years.

EARL BEAUCHAMP asked why the new licence should be given for seven years at all

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The object in giving a licence for seven years is to give the licensee time to recoup himself for his outlay when the licence is granted. In no possibility in this case can there be a grievance which might lead to the reproduction of the demand for compensation. That is the idea of the Amendment, and in order to give the quarter sessions, or the licensing or brewster sessions, a complete power to make such an experiment as they think fit, these words are introduced.

LORD SHUTTLEWORTH insisted that it should be made abundantly clear that no claim for compensation could arise, because at the end of the term a new licence was given, and not a renewal of the licence. Did not the noble Marquess see that if the old system was kept on at the same time that annual licences were granted, the holders of them might say, "We have not taken a licence for a term of years; we have an annual licence—the old form of licence, which it has been recognised by Parliament ought to have a perpetual value attached to it." Was there not a great risk if they kept annual licences going, besides the new system of licences for a term of years, that they would have the sam evil arising which they were attempting to deal with in this Bill?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think the noble Lord is fully entitled to make those observations. The seven-years licence is intended only to meet the cases where presumably there must be a considerable outlay on the licensed premises, as in the cases of hotels where a considerable outlay has to be made, and it will take a number of years in order to make sufficient profit to defray the expenditure. But the seven-years licence has this blemish, that while it is current the control of it will be largely removed from the brewster sessions. It is only in a case of a direct breach of the law for which the licensee can be convicted that his conduc will come under the control of the brewster sessions. His Majesty's Government, although they think in cases of houses which will require extensive outlay the seven-years licence would be suitable, do not think it would be suitable in cases of ordinary public-houses, and therefore it would be proper to keep on the annual system which keeps the houses annually under the control of brewster sessions. The licence then has to come up every year for renewal, and the holder's conduct can be looked nto, and if he ash fallen short of his undertakings under the clause he can be called to account. We think, therefore, you will require both forms of licences—the seven-years licence for the house which incurs extensive outlay, such as hotels, and the annual licence for the ordinary public-house. It appears to b best to leave a free hand to the licensing bench to grant either a long or a short licence, therefore both are put into the clause, and we propose to trust the brewster sessions to act with wisdom and adopt which course they think fit.

LORD DAVEY thought there was a danger in the language in which the meaning was expressed. He had no doubt himself as to how he should construe it if the matter came before him at brewster sessions, but he was not sure that all his brethren would construe it in the same way. The clause said that any application for the re-grant of a seven-years licence should be treated as an application to grant a new licence and not as an applicaton for the renewal of a licence. He did not see the *sequitur* in these words at all. It might be inferred from them that the meaning was that if there was a seven-years term the justices were to have a discretion to renew it, but if there was only a one-year term the justices were not in the same position with regard to it. He did not quite see the necessity for saying that at the end of the seven years it should be treated as an application for a new licence when it would really be a renewal. It was a matter of drafting.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY remarked that the word "term" did not apply to the first licence, which was merely called an annual licence. When the length of time for which the licence was granted was beyond that of an annual licence it was called a "term." There was likely to grow up in the minds of the magistrates the idea that the new licence granted for one year only had a stronger equitable claim to renewal even though the population of the district might be such as to operate against it. It was a dangerous thing to have in the one clause a word which suggested a different treatment for a new licence every time it came up, whether it was first given for one year or seven years.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My noble and learned friend Lord Davey construes the clause as I myself should construe it. With reference to the danger suggested by Lord Stanley of Alderley, you strike at the whole history of what we are now doing by way of legislation, for it will be utterly impossible for anybody to come to the conclusion that there is anything but a mere annual licence after what we have done.

LORD DAVEY: Has the noble Earl sat on petty sessions and known what things are suggested?

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I was for thirteen years a chairman of quarter sessions and I think I know what has been suggested.

Lord SHUTTLEWORTH wished to ask a Question which he did not think had been answered. Why should there be a difference in the mode of treating, a new licence for one year from a licence for a term? If there was nothing in it it would be better to treat them in the same way. Was there not a danger that there would arise in the minds of those who held a licence for one year only the idea that they would have a claim to be treated in the same way as old licensees for one year.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: We are drifting away from the actual words of the Amendment and putting an interpretation on a subsequent sub-section. Perhaps we had better come to a decision on the Amendment proposed by the noble Marquess.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY asked whether the Government would have any objection to inserting a further Amendment in Sub-section 3, to make it read "that in the case of all these licences any application for the re-grant of a licence shall be treated as an application for a new licence."?

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: I would suggest to the noble Lord that this course would be a little inconvenient as the Amendment is not down upon the Paper. Perhaps the noble Lord will put it down for a subsequent stage.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I do not think that would be a suitable way of dealing with the matter, for this reason. During the continuance of a new licence renewed from year to year the same conditions will apply. If the justices desire that different conditions should apply they will put an end to the annual licence and grant a new licence. But in the ordinary and normal course the same conditions will apply and that is the most convenient method of procedure. In the case of the longer licences of seven years we do not intend that the conditions should apply. We intend that, at the end of seven years, the thing should be reconsidered and new conditions imposed.

Lord DAVEY said that on consideration he thought the Bill was right for the reason that an ordinary licensee under the new law had a right to have his licence renewed and not treated as a new application. On the other hand, on the expiration of the seven or five years term, it was intended, as he understood, that it should be both in name and substance a new grant.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: That is so.

On the Motion of the Lord Chancellor, Lord Cross took the Chair in the room of Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Earl GREY moved to omit Sub-section 3. It was said that this was the best clause in the Bill, but, in his opinion, it was the worst, on the ground that to fix a limit was to provide a direct inducement to the licence-holder to push the sale of alcoholic liquor so that he might make sufficient profit to recover during the term of tenure the amount of capital invested in the house at the beginning of the term. There were many public-houses put up by trust companies, costing from £5,000 to £10,000 in capital, and these would be seriously prejudiced. He should infinitely prefer to see all licences annual licences and the justices making such conditions as they thought fit in order to secure that trust companies and licence-holders should make provision for the wise management of their houses.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 19, to leave out Sub-section 3."—(*Earl Grey.*)

Earl BEAUCHAMP agreed with Earl Grey in this matter, and said he should vote for the omission of the sub-section. If, on the other hand, the Government could see their way, by any Amendment which might approve itself to them, to make it certain that no compensation would be given under Sub-section 3 and Sub-section 1, he would withdraw any opposition to this sub-section. He knew it was the wish of the Government that there should not be compensation, and if they would say that distinctly in the Bill, he would be satisfied.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I cannot conceive the possibility of any doubt about that. The compensation must be applicable only to those licences which are existing on-licences. There are three or four sections in which it is pointed out without the slightest doubt that there can be no compensation except in respect to existing licences.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: Under the Bill, as it stands at present, exactly the same claim will grow up as has grown up in the past.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I sympathise with what has fallen from the noble Earl, Earl Grey, with respect to the sub-section, but I should like to call his attention to the remarks I made just now, in which I pointed out that it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government that this long term should be employed in the case of ordinary licences and ordinary public-houses. I agree with him that the objection which he has urged is sound, and in the cases of ordinary public-houses it would be a mistake to remove them for a term of seven years from the immediate control of the licensing bench, and to give them an inducement to push the sale of alcoholic liquor with great vigour during the seven years in order to make hay while the sun shines. I do not think that criticism applies to hotels. I think it would be extravagant in that case. We have to cover both cases, and it seemed to us better to insert the provision in the general sub-section, and trust to the good sense of the licensing bench to interpret it properly. We are not in favour of dictating on too rigid lines to the licensing benches exactly as to how they are to conduct their affairs. It is far wiser, in dealing with Clause 4, to give them a wide discretion. It has always been urged that this is in the nature of an experimental clause, and His Majesty's Government are most anxious to give a free hand to the licensing authorities to try experiments under it as to what may be the best form of licences. After a good number of years, when the experiments have been tried, the best system will appear, and perhaps Parliament will be asked to legislate again.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH said he arrived at the same goal as the noble Lord, Earl Grey, but by a different road, and if the noble Earl went to a division, although for different reasons, he should certainly support the omission of the sub-section, because he did not like the two systems running together which, he feared, would cause great confusion, and even friction and jealousy.

EARL GREY said he did not like the sub-section, but he would withdraw the Amendment, as he did not wish to take up the time of the House.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

LORD NEWTON moved to omit Sub-section 4 of Clause 4. This sub-section allocated the payment for new licences to the relief of local taxation, and therefore it appeared that the locality would have a direct pecuniary interest in the granting of a new licence. The object of the Bill was to diminish the number of public-houses, but at the same time there might be a reaction, and in that case municipalities and local authorities might, with the object of lightening the burden of rates, exert pressure and secure the granting of new licences. He was somewhat afraid that there was some technical or practical reason why this Amendment could not be accepted, otherwise he believed the Government were not altogether out of sympathy with it. He would suggest to the trio of noble Lords who were in charge of the Bill that if they were unable to accept the Amendment they should undertake to consider it before the Report stage.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out Sub-section 4."—(*Lord Newton.*)

LORD FARRER supported the Amendment. The Lord Privy Seal last evening expressed very strongly the desire of His Majesty's Government that all new monopoly values should be kept in the hands of the public. It appeared to him (Lord Farrer) that as the Bill stood at present there was every inducement for a locality to sell the licence to the highest bidder. Anyone who had had, as he had, experience in attempting to get trust houses established would see that under the present arrangement they would be in a much worse position than they were now. It appeared to him that under the whole section the justices, when they came together in quarter sessions, would simply have to consider either the question of surrender or what they could get for the public. He should like to ask the noble Marquess what the Government meant by the words "securing to the public any monopoly value." As the words stood they must simply mean that the justices should take the highest bid. In that case the trust companies and other experimental institutions of that sort would have no chance at all. They could not buy against the breweries, who could always either surrender licences or give a much higher price than trust companies could possibly afford. He could not believe, considering the enormous increase in local expenditure of late, that it would be otherwise. For instance, in his own county the education rate had gone up from 3d. to 7d. this year. Surely the local authorities would be inclined to make as much money as they could, and in that case the trust companies would be in a hopeless position. He hoped they would get some explanation of what these words really meant.

EARL GREY associated himself with the appeal of the noble Lord that the Government would reconsider this matter on Report. He attached great importance to it. Those of their Lordships who had acquainted themselves with the literature on this temperance question would be aware that Mr. Rowntree, and that large school of temperance reformers who worked with him, were agreed that there was nothing more dangerous than to allow profits realised from public-houses to be devoted to objects which were properly chargeable on the rates. The experience of Scandinavia was conclusive that this was a most dangerous principle, and he hoped that His Majesty's Government would listen favourably to the appeal to postpone the sub-section until the Report stage in order to reconsider the way in which the appropriation of the profits should be made.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY inquired whether it was competent for that House to entertain the question at all. Did not the noble Marquess observe that it was not competent for them to entertain any proposal which would increase the rates? This sub-section had come from the House of Commons and allocated a certain revenue to the rates, and their Lordships had no power to interfere with matters of taxation.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I think there is a great deal to be said for that view, but I do not quite agree with the noble Lord so far as to say it is outside the competence of your Lordships' House to strike out the sub-section altogether. What would be the position when you have struck it out? There would be no provision in the Bill for the allocation of these funds at all. If you proceeded to suggest that the funds should go to the National Exchequer, I have not the slightest doubt that you would be going beyond your powers. It is not possible for us to agree to strike out this sub-section, and so leave the whole matter in the air. I think that to some extent the fears of the noble Lords opposite are unfounded. After all is said and done, even supposing that the local authority is actuated by the misguided principles suggested by noble Lords opposite—namely, a desire to make money and save the rates at the expense of the sobriety of the people—even then I venture to think that the amount which would be realised would be so trifling that such a temptation is practically out of the question. The noble Lord talked about his education rate rising from 3d. to 7d. It would have to be a very wholesale disposal of new licences which would reimburse the County of Surrey the difference between 3d. and 7d. in the rates. It was asked, "What is the meaning of monopoly value, and how are you going to prevent that monopoly value from falling into the hands of any private person except by putting the licence up to the highest bidder?" It is not a question of securing a large monopoly value to the public, but of not letting anyone else except the public have the monopoly value. I would point out that the persons who grant the licences are the licensing justices and not the local authority, who it is supposed is going to misuse the money. There is no reason whatever why they should not simply impose conditions without any money payment at all or with a very small payment, and if there were conditions similar to those under which the trust with which the noble Lord, Earl Grey, is associated, is conducted, it is perfectly possible for the licensing justices to say that on receiving an undertaking and guarantee that you are not going to make more than a reasonable profit on the outlay of your capital from the sale of liquor, they will grant you a licence for one of your public-houses to be carried on under those conditions, having satisfied themselves that the result will not be to give to any private person the monopoly value which, if given to anybody, must go to the public.

THE EARL OF CREWE thought that the noble Earl had underrated the gravity of the question. As to the competence of the House to deal with the matter at all, he granted that if they were to strike out the sub-section there would be no provision made for dealing with the money so raised, but that need not trouble their Lordships if they disapproved of the sub-section, because he conceived that the effect would be to make it necessary to amend the Bill in another place. He confessed that the noble Earl had greatly underrated the extent to which, particularly in the cases of the smaller authorities, a temptation to get anything off the rates affected those bodies. All of their Lordships who were familiar with the details of local government knew that the chance of getting anything off the rates only too often outweighed every other consideration in the minds of local authorities. If it was possible to give any further consideration to this matter by bringing it up again at a later stage it would be of the greatest possible advantage, because he felt that the noble Lords opposite had not felt its gravity to any extent, and that was indicated in the words used by the noble Earl.

EARL GREY wished to ask the noble Marquess a Question on this subject. The noble Earl had pointed out that this clause would not affect the appropriation of profits realised by trust companies. He (Earl Grey) took it that if the words remained as at present the licensing authorities might make it a condition of granting a new licence that the house should be managed on trust principles, and then every penny of profit realised by that company would go to objects properly chargeable to the rates. He would much rather it went to a national compensation fund, and he thought it was within the powers of the House to decide that those profits which were not taxes should go to a national compensation fund. He again urged the Government not to take up a hard-and-fast position on this question, but to allow it to be reconsidered on Report.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I think it is a most difficult thing to discuss in your Lordships' House a proposal for destroying the method proposed in the Bill for dealing with this money and yet not to substitute any other. It is impossible for us to agree to strike out this provision in the Bill unless we have some words before us showing how the noble Earl and others desire to replace them. I do not, however, like to give an absolute refusal to my noble friend, but what I suggest is that he should submit to us privately, if it is against the privileges of the other House to do it publicly, what he proposes as an alternative, and then we will consider it from that point of view. Although I say that out of courtesy to the noble Lords, I cannot hold out much hope that any change will be favourably received, I think that would meet their wishes, and I suggest that the Amendment should be withdrawn.

LORD NEWTON said that in view of the promise made by the noble Marquess he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The Amendment which I now move is to carry out the object which I announced to your Lordships when we were dealing with Sub-section 3. I told you then that it was necessary to strike out certain words because the powers conferred by them in the first sub-section of the clause were only applicable to county quarter sessions and we wanted them to be applied to county boroughs as well.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 38, after the words '874' to insert as a new sub-section the words: '(6.)

On the confirmation of a new on-licence, the confirming authority may, with the consent of the justices of the licensing district, vary any conditions attached to the licence under the provisions of this section.' "—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD moved to insert a new clause after Clause 4. He said that the Amendment he had placed on the Paper had not, as he feared, so much chance of being accepted as he should have desired; but if by any chance it should be accepted, he wished to say that two or three words were accidentally omitted, which, if necessary, could be added at a later stage. They were in line 4 from the bottom after the words "alcoholic liquors" and were "or any other article." The reason for this was that his objection was not to the exclusive dealing in this connection as between owner and tenant in alcoholic liquors only, but in any article of consumption. He felt that the owners of tied houses in making conditions as to exclusive dealing with the tenants of their houses had been taking advantage of an opportunity to establish a system of exclusive dealing which was never contemplated by the licensing law. Moreover, it was extremely detrimental to the public interest. He objected to the whole principle of exclusive dealing. The system had now grown to enormous proportions. He was reminded of the Truck Acts. So long ago as 1831 it was enacted that this kind of condition as between an employer and his workmen should no longer be legal, and that the employer, for instance, should be bound to pay wages in coin without any stipulation as to how those wages should be spent; that goods should not be supplied by the employer; and, further, that no set-off for goods supplied from any shop in which the employer was interested should be allowed. He was not a lawyer, but looking at the matter as one of natural equity, it seemed to him that a tenant in these circumstances, considering the public interests at stake, should have the same kind of protection which the workman enjoyed under the Truck Acts, and that he should have the same freedom to buy his goods in the open market in free competition—the best goods he could find in order that he might supply the best to the public. Above all, he felt that the public interest should so far be protected in the matter. It was not fair to the public to allow owners of these houses to set up this quite exceptional and extraordinary system of exclusive dealing. He desired to secure that those who had to deal with these licences should take care in their discretion, and as a matter of public interest, to strike off these fetters of exclusive dealing by which the publican in a tied house was at present bound. Most of their Lordships would remember that in the course of the discussions before Viscount Peel's Commission a publican in the North of England declared that he was tied for everything he bought except sawdust. That was detrimental to the interests of the public, and a system of privileged trading which had so secretly grown up should be stopped.

In dealing with this matter they were not dealing with any old-established rights. The system of exclusive dealing in tied houses was quite a late growth. As lately as the year 1883, according to an official year book of the trade, there were only fourteen of these companies with tied houses, and as late as 1888 when the "Sharp *v.* Wakefield," case came up, there were only forty-four, while now these companies had grown to 380, so that it was a very modern growth. But while it was modern it raised a question of the gravest importance, because these companies had secured the bulk of the trade, some 85 to 90 per cent. of the licensed houses in some counties and 75 per cent. in others being now tied houses, and the tenants bound by the fetters of exclusive dealing. He did not desire to blame in any way those who had built up the properties or the companies who had pursued this policy, because they had pursued it in the natural course of business, and the Legislature, in an absent-minded sort of way, had allowed them to pursue it. The system had grown up, as so many things grew up, because it was not realised what was involved in the system, until it had assumed grave and dangerous proportions. There were many companies with tied houses serving the public as well as any other houses, but the law was not for the righteous man but for the unrighteous, and sooner or later this question ought to be dealt with by the State. He could not but feel that this was a proper time for giving the matter serious consideration.

Their Lordships were familiar with the objections urged against the tied-house system, and some of the defects which tended to make it detrimental to the public interest. A good deal of evidence was brought before Viscount Peel's Commission showing that the tendency of the system was to push and increase the trade in liquor. There was evidence on page 104 of the evidence taken by the commission showing that in one case a stipulation was made that the tenant must undertake to sell so many barrels a year. There was evidence in another case that an owner complained that his tenant was not selling enough. In some cases tenants were bound, whether they would or not, to keep open every lawful hour, when they might have been glad on many occasions not to do so. There was also abundant evidence of the objection the tied-house brewers had to a six-day licence. In the county of Cheshire there were forty-seven six-day licences, but of that number only four were held by tied houses, and the rest were licences held by free publicans not bound by the chains of the exclusive-dealing system. There was undoubted evidence that the system in the cases of many of these companies was one which tended to push the trade and stimulate the drinking habits of the country. Coming to a second objection, they found that persons of experience constantly brought to their notice the fact that the system tended, in a particular district where a certain brewery had a monopoly or anything approaching it, to the supplying of an inferior article and thus robbing the public of an interest which the licensing justices ought to secure to them. In his own county of Hereford he had an opportunity not long ago of seeing the working of that tendency to supply an inferior article. A neighbour of his, a late Member of the other House, much interested in the trade in their county cider, brought before the public two facts. One of the cider manufacturers supplied cider to a considerable number of houses in the Midland counties. Those houses all came into the hands of a brewery company, and the manufacturer received an intimation from the manager of the company that in future he was to supply all his cider not direct to the tenants, but to the company. He was glad to do so because he thought the company would probably help to increase his trade. But having done so he soon began to find that his trade was falling off, and that the cider was gradually no longer required, because the agent of the company desired to sell the company's beer and not his neighbour's cider. The other case was from another manufacturer, who had an application from the manager of one of these breweries to supply him with cider. The manager is reported to have said, "You need not send us your best cider, you may send us your worst," or to this effect. He did not wish to increase the trade in good cider, but the trade in the beer which his firm produced. He (the Lord Bishop of Hereford) said it was not to the public interest that a system of that sort should be encouraged or allowed to go on.

There was another objection to the system which had not attracted sufficient notice: that was, that it tended to a very insufficient assessment of the houses, and that, therefore, the public income from the assessed houses was being reduced to much less than it ought to be year by year. He had in his mind—it was always best to form an opinion from a concrete case—a house not far from his own lodge gates in Hereford. He was credibly informed that the house was not long ago bought by one of the speculative brewery companies. It was a modest little house, and was bought up at a cost of £3,000. No less than another £1,000 was spent upon it, and it is now probably bearing a rent of about £60 a year. That was surely a very unhealthy state of things, and the sooner it was ended the better for the interests of the community.

An even stronger objection to this system was the insecurity of the licence-holder's tenure, and the precarious position in which experience showed them he was placed. The licence-holder was often hardly a free man. They were told of cases in which blank transfers were actually prepared to be filled up. Further, they had the very serious objection to the system that it tended to withdraw the houses from the effective control of the licensing magistrates. As a matter of fact, the licensing magistrates of their own city had not the same effective control over doubtful houses if they were tied houses as they had when the houses were free. He held in his hand a letter from a man of great experience, who, of his own motion, raised this very objection, and who wrote saying he had hopes that it might be pressed that the tied-house system tended to take the effective control out of the hands of the licensing justices and, as he put it, tended to make the position of the tied house unassailable. This gentleman was a clerk to the justices of thirty years standing in an important town, and he was a Churchman and a Conservative, so that it was simply in the interests of good government that he objected to the system. He said that for misconduct a licence was often refused by the local justices, and an appeal was made to quarter sessions, but by the time it arrived the company owner was ready to say, "We quite admit the case, but we have changed the tenant," and things went on as before. In the same way with structural repairs, he said that if repairs were required before renewal, and anything like refusal was threatened, an appeal was lodged, and by the time it got to the quarter sessions the company was prepared to say that they had prepared plans and would do what was required. So that, as this experienced clerk to the justices said, the system tended to an inordinate extent to take the control out of the hands of the licensing justices. Therefore, he (the Lord Bishop of Hereford) thought that they had a very strong array of reasoning against allowing this system to continue; a system which had grown up secretly and unnoticed, and was a new system and, to a certain extent, an illegitimate system—because he held that it was never intended that a system of exclusive dealing should have been set up under the shelter of justices making arrangements for the benefit of the public.

He hoped that they would see some such power given to the justices as he had ventured to suggest in his Amendment. Undoubtedly the tenant suffered by the present system. He suffered by liability to eviction—almost summary eviction; and he suffered, according to the evidence, by high valuation—a point on which the evidence brought before Viscount Peel's Commission had not been sufficiently studied in either House of Parliament. The tenant also suffered by the hard terms of the agreement. If he succeeded, his rent was liable to be raised; if he failed he was liable to be summarily dismissed; and, as a matter of fact, in his tenure he had no adequate freedom. Then, again, the public suffered in one case and another by the loss of magisterial control; by the loss of assessment value—a very large loss, he believed; and by the loss of free competition, for in many cases they could not get the best article. If the tenant and the public were both sufferers, why should the law allow this new growth, which had been absolutely prohibited in many analogous cases, to continue? Exclusive dealing in any form was detrimental to the public interest, and it was not quite creditable that under the shadow of a public grant any such system should be allowed to continue. The question was asked, "Are you going to deal unfairly with the brewers?" He said there could be no unfairness in ending a system which had grown up in such a way. The brewery owner would be left in possession of his premises and still be in the enjoyment of all the rights of any other owner; he would only be prevented from following this objectionable practice. The owner might reap the further benefit of being able to let his house at a proper rent. There was no reason why he should not put his house up to auction and get the highest rent he could, and the house would be proportionately valued and the public would gain. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, after Clause 4, to insert the following clause: 'The licensing authorities before granting or renewing a licence may, at their discretion, require from the applicant for a licence an undertaking to the effect that he has not entered into, nor will, during the period for which the licence is valid, enter into, or become a party to, any agreement or contract whereby there is or may be granted or reserved to the owners or owner of the premises to which the licence attaches, or to any person or persons to be nominated by him or them, an exclusive right of supplying any or all of the alcoholic liquors to be sold by the applicant on the said premises; and any agreement or contract entered into by the applicant in contravention of such undertaking as aforesaid shall be null and void and shall entail the forfeiture of the licence.'"—(*The Lord Bishop of Hereford.*)

*LORD HYLTON said that before he referred to the speech of the right rev. Prelate he desired for a moment to take up the taunt or challenge that was directed a ainst noble Lords on the Back Benches on that side of the House by the noble Lord, Earl Carrington, when he said that none of them seemed to be enthusiastic in support of the Bill. He (Lord Hylton) believed that supporters of the Government who sat upon the Back Benches were very enthusiastic in support of the Bill, because they believed it was a measure likely to bring about certain temperance reforms, which were as dear to them as to the noble Lords opposite. He went further, and said that the Licensing Act of 1902 and the measure brought forward in the present session were more than any other Government had done for the cause of temperance reform at any time. Coming to the speech of the right rev. Prelate, he had, like many other speakers, referred to the evolution of the tied-house system as something abnormal, extraordinary, and partaking of the character of a political Frankenstein. He ventured to think that the system which had sprung up, whether they deplored it or not, was merely an illustration of the general tendency that had been spreading for the last few years, and was continuing to spread, namely the combination of manufacturers for the manufacture and distribution of articles of all kinds. They might deplore this tendency, but it seemed to him illogical to deplore a particular combination for the production and sale of beer more than to deplore a combination for the production and sale of tobacco. The right rev. Prelate ought to bring in a Bill to prohibit a combination for the production and sale of any manufacture whatever. He held no brief for the great brewery companies, nor did he own a single share in any such companies, but he thought that those who declaimed against the "tyranny" of the tied-house system seemed to lose sight of the fact that any contract between a landlord and tenant was one entered into freely by both parties, and out of which both parties expected to gain. He could not understand how the word "illegitimate" could be used with regard to the contract between the owners and tenants of tied houses, and he did not believe that the majority of tied houses were otherwise than perfectly well conducted. It would be folly for men—the shareholders and managers of great brewery companies—to invest their money in these houses and then put in persons as managers who were likely to cause the licence to be lost by misconduct or in any other way.

In passing, he should like to refer to a point rather in favour of the system of tied-houses. He had known personally of a case where a small, old, licensed free house had fallen into a ruined condition. It was let on lease to a large brewery company on the condition that they made it commodious and suitable in every way for a licensed house, and in its present condition it was of far greater benefit to the neighbourhood than it was before. With regard to the crusade against licensed victuallers entered upon by the right rev. Prelate, it was forgotten in many cases that the inn in the country village was the only place in which the accommodation which travellers required could be obtained. It meant nothing to such a traveller whether the house was a free or a tied one. The class of men who went to such houses did not trouble whether the house was supplied from one brewery or another, nor did they care so long as the articles supplied were what they were represented to be. If the article was adulterated, let the police prosecute and the magistrates refuse the licence without compensation. For the owner can and should be held responsible for the act of his tenant. As to the compensation, he should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that over and over again the opponents of this Bill had spoken as if the compensation was to be provided by additional taxation, another penny on the income-tax, or an imposition of that sort; whereas, as a matter of fact, all the compensation was to be provided by the trade itself. That made a great deal of difference in considering the matter. He should certainly vote against the proposal of the right rev. Prelate.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I do not think I need enter into a long discussion upon the merits or the demerits of tied houses. We discussed that point at very great length upon an Amendment moved by the noble and learned Lord, Lord Coleridge, on the first clause of this Bill. I do not know that I should have very much fault to find with the Amendment of the right rev. Prelate if he had omitted two words in the Amendment, except that in that case, I think, it would have been unnecessary. The right rev. Prelate purposes that the licensing authorities before granting or renewing a licence may require the applicant to do certain things. The Bill provides that the justices shall make any condition they like on granting a new licence, and it is therefore perfectly within the competence of the magistrates in granting any future licence to make such conditions as the right rev. Prelate thinks are desirable. I cannot for the life of me see why because a system has grown up—whether it has been legitimate or illegitimate or grown up recently or many years ago — and attaches to certain houses, that therefore you should say, "I will make it a condition of refusing to renew your licence without compensation unless you entirely alter the system under which you carry on your trade." The object of this measure is to provide compensation at the expense of the trade themselves, and I can see no reason whetever for refusing to renew a licence without compensation because that licence has been taken in a manner which the right rev. Prelate considers to be illegitimate.

On Question, "That the clause be added to the Bill," resolved in the negative.

Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH resumed the Chair.

Clause 5 :—

LORD COLERIDGE moved an Amendment providing that the committee of quarter sessions should be composed of one-half of representative persons and one-half of nominated persons. The words he proposed to add were framed on the Scotch system which was passed by His Majesty's Government last year. There might be some Scotch noble Lords in the House, and if so they would be able to testify to the admirable working of the Scotch system. In the Scotch Licensing Act the confirming authority, both in burghs and in counties, was composed one-half of representative persons and one-half of persons in a nominated capacity. So to that system there could be no possible objection in principle, because it was embodied in the Bill of the Government last year. There was nothing he knew of in Scotland to make he licensing system any different there from what it was in this country. The advantage of it would be that it would create a confidence in the confirming body which would certainly tend to make its decisions more mature and more representative of a wider area of public opinion. He might add that his two Amendments hung together; if the first was rejected the other would naturally fall. He had separated them because the Bill itself separated the definitions of the two bodies, one applied to the county body and the other to the borough body. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 2, after the word 'committee' to insert the words 'consisting of members of the quarter sessions appointed by the quarter sessions and members of the county council appointed by the county council in equal numbers.'"—(*Lord Coleridge.*)

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I confess I am not very familiar with the practice which obtains in Scotland, but I do know something of the administration, both by urban authorities and by rural authorities, of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors and for music and dancing. I think we have always held that it was very undesirable that in exercising judicial functions we should put upon the bench men who had recently submitted themselves to a popular election. There is an exception to that, namely, the chairmen of urban and district councils and the chairmen of borough councils in London, who are during the term of their office *ex officio* justices of the peace. I am not quite sure that that has worked really well. I have noticed in the evidence given before Viscount Peel's Commission that more than one witness pointed out that a magistrate coming to the bench, having recently stood at a contested election, was apt to look upon gratitude as not only being for past favours but also as the expectation of favours to come, and that it was many months before the magistrate who had been popularly elected succeeded in training himself to a judicial frame of mind. I have for some years had the honour of being a member of the London County Council. That body has entrusted to it the administration of the music and dancing licences in London, and I must say that of all the duties which that body performs there is none which, in my opinion, might with greater advantage be removed from their jurisdiction. When I say that, I am expressing the opinion of a great many of those on both sides in politics in that Assembly, who think that a judicial authority and not an elected authority is the proper one to deal with licences of all kinds. I do not think the noble Lord, Lord Coleridge, will expect that His Majesty's Government will lend any favour to effecting through a Bill of this kind so important an alteration in the law as that of associating with the justices of the peace an elective element equal in number for the purpose of administering the Bill. Therefore I must oppose the Amendment.

Earl SPENCER: My Lords, I conceive that this Amendment raises a very important point indeed. It is a point on which many of us are extremely doubtful—namely, how the Bill itself is to be interpreted. My noble friend who has just spoken referred to a judicial action. I think a great deal may be said about magistrates, and only magistrates, taking part in judicial action, and I do not at all agree with him that these men put on as *ex officio* magistrates, because they are made magistrates as chairmen of local bodies, are therefore not good magistrates. I want to know whether under this measure this committee is to act judicially or administratively. That is of first importance, we have been discussing it, we feel extremely doubtful as to what the proper interpretation is. My belief is that the committee ought to be administrative, and wholly administrative, and I should desire to divide the administrative from the judicial functions quite distinctly. The committee appointed by quarter sessions should be administrative, and quarter sessions should retain their judicial power. It is possible that this may be the proper interpretation of the Act, but I rather doubt it. I should like to know, is this committee appointed by quarter sessions considered by the Government to be both judicial and administrative? I think that would be extremely confusing and likely to lead to bad results. I am not acquainted with the Scotch law, and I do not know how far the precedent which has been quoted runs, but I want particularly to find out in the case of these committees what the functions of these bodies are to be. There is a great distinction between a body which acts judicially and one that acts administratively. I myself, as chairman of quarter sessions, have sat judicially on a very large appeal on a public-house rating case. There, of course, counsel and not solicitors appeared before me to argue. There may be some difficulty in putting on quarter sessions anybody who is not a magistrate, as being contrary to the practice, and it will lead to considerable difficulty, in my opinion. I think it would be a great advantage to define these matters quite distinctly, and therefore I put this Question to the Government in order that they may clearly explain to us what the intention of the Bill is in respect to this matter.

The Earl of Onslow.

Lord BELPER: I have some difficulty in following the remarks of the noble Earl. I quite understand the question he has asked, but I do not see how it enforces the Amendment which proposes to put a number of gentlemen representative of the county council on the committee, and therefore to make the committee half judicial and half administrative if they are put on.

Earl SPENCER: I think I was perfectly clear, I wanted to know before this Bill was passed what the opinion of the Government was as to whether the committee was to be administrative or judicial.

Lord BELPER: I did not understand whether the noble Earl was arguing in favour of the Amendment or not. As regards the Question, I think it is clear that a large part of the duties of the committee of quarter sessions must be in the first instance purely administrative. They will have to consider the reports made to them from all the different parts of the county in relation to the sum which they have to expend per annum; they will have to draw up some regular scheme for dealing every year with the reduction of licences in the different districts; and they will have to consider how far in each district they will be enabled by the funds at their disposal to reduce licences. They will have to deal with these sort of matters, and a considerable amount of them will be administrative. When they come to consider the particular cases brought before them and to deal with them I take it their duties will be a good deal judicial.

EARL SPENCER: How does that define? What is a good deal judicial?

LORD BELPER: I say with regard to these cases their duties will be judicial. The reason I rose was not for the purpose of answering the Question so much, but to deal with the Amendment put before the House. The Amendment proposes to put an equal number of the representatives of the county council on the committee with an equal number of representatives of quarter sessions. That, I think, is the effect of the proposal. I do not wish to say one word against the fact, which must be admitted, that the representatives of the county council may be, many of them, gentlemen well suited to act in a position of that sort. But what I think has been recognised, and recognised widely in England—I do not know the case of Scotland which has been quoted so well—is that it is not desirable to mix up the county council with a question which creates so strong a feeling in the country as that with regard to licences. As a member of the London County Council I most strongly deprecate the county council having any powers with regard to licensing. I believe it would have a very bad effect on the constitution of the county council itself, because there are many gentlemen on the county council who are exceedingly valuable members, but who would decline to take part in and expose themselves to an election which would turn purely on the liquor question and mix them up with the advocates of the extreme sections on both sides with regard to licensing matters. I sincerely believe that it would in that way be a serious injury to the county council, and although this Amendment would not give powers directly to county councils to discuss this matter on the council, yet it is quite clear that if you had to elect a number of gentlemen on a committee of this sort an opportunity would be given to the county council for discussing the manner in which the licensing law should be carried out. For that reason alone I deprecate the change in the Bill proposed by the Amendment of putting on a number of representatives from the county council instead of allowing the committee, as suggested by the Bill, to be a committee of the quarter sessions appointed completely by the quarter sessions.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said he wished his noble friend opposite had been of the same opinion he appeared to hold now, as to entrusting duties likely to lead to serious differences of opinion on the county council, when in 1902 the Education Bill was under discussion. If he had taken that view then and held it to be a mistake to hand over to the county council that very controversial question, he would have been more consistent in bringing forward the argument he had just advanced. He agreed with the noble Lord that if they were going to give the licensing power to the county council, it would then probably seriously affect the choice of members to serve on the county council, just as he thought the Education Act of 1902 had already had an injurious effect upon the county council in regard to the discharge of their special functions. But that was not the question raised by his noble and learned friend Lord Coleridge. The Amendment did not propose to give licensing powers to the county council; it only proposed that members of the county council should be associated with quarter sessions in that particular work. He doubted whether that amount of obligation on the county council on this question would have any real practical effect upon the elections to the county council. On the contrary, he believed that it would introduce a useful element into the new committee that was about to be established. Having some experience on this matter, he did not share the objection which the noble Lord raised to this particular proposal. He thought that what they did want very much, and what they would ultimately have to give—whether they gave it now or ten years hence—was a share in this question of licensing to the direct representatives of the people. He was convinced that was what they would have to give, and he thought the proposal of his noble and learned friend took a step in that direction.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, it seems to me that the far-reaching effect of this proposal has not reached the minds of the noble Lords opposite. You must remember that all the Licensing Acts from 1828 onward assume that quarter sessions and the members of it who are magistrates for the county, more or less are to be the persons who have to deal with this matter. For the first time you now propose to introduce persons outside the magistrates of the county. I do not know how many Acts of Parliament you are repealing in that respect by such an Amendment as this. I say nothing about the merits of it, but it is a matter which obviously ought not to be put forward in a Bill of this sort, which is a Bill to amend procedure in the method of granting licences. Now at this time, when the Bill has reached this House, you are asked to introduce into the tribunal an outside element. That seems to me such an extraordinary and far-reaching change in the whole structure of the Bill that I hope your Lordships will not dream of introducing it into the Bill. I doubt very much whether it is strictly within the ambit of the Bill, but if it is, it is such a departure from the whole system under which licensing has been carried on that I think it would be properly the subject of a complete Bill in itself rather than that it should be introduced in this way by a side wind into a Bill of this sort. With regard to the other question, mixed up as it is with the different character of quarter sessions, I think I may answer my hon. friend—I hope satisfactorily—but I think I may answer him by giving him the authority of this House. The Court of quarter sessions, consisting of magistrates of the county, has a double capacity. It has duties which are absolutely administrative, and it has duties which are absolutely judicial. But besides these two divisions, which are very clear in themselves, it has often been said that even in their administrative functions they should act in a judicial spirit and discretion. These phrases have sometimes led them into some confusion. As licensing authorities they are simply administrative. But it has been said justly, that although they have only an administrative function they ought to administer it in a judicial spirit. Hence has arisen the confusion. It is entirely a misapprehension to suppose that they have any judicial authority at all. A stream can rise no higher than its source, and when they are appointed as substitutes for brewster sessions they are there as an administrative body and have no judicial power whatever. I have not the slightest doubt that that is the true position of the law, and I trust your Lordships will not accept the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord.

LORD COLERIDGE could not accept the definition of the Bill as one to amend the procedure in regard to the method of granting licences, and he did not think it came well from the Government to object to the introduction of matters of principle into the Bill. If ever there was a Bill which introduced a new principle it was this Bill. He did not think the noble Earl was present when he (Lord Coleridge) mentioned to the House that this Amendment merely embodied the principle of licensing which was introduced by the Government into the Scotch Bill last year. Therefore this novel principle and far-reaching alteration had already been adopted. No doubt it was for the advantage of the country that they should have a Scotch Prime Minister, but he did not see why the Scotch should get all the good legislation.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 23; Not-Contents, 76.

CONTENTS.

Ripon, M.

Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.

Temple, E.

Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L.
Davey, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)

Kinnaird, L.
Monkswell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Welby, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Marlborough, D.
Wellington, D.

Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Landsdowne, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Bradford, E.
Camperdown, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Drogheda, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Lathom, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Lytton, E.

Malmesbury, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Powis, E.
Selborne, E.
Stanhope, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.

Bath and Wells, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.

Addington, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Balfour, L.
Belper, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.

Cheylesmore, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Forester, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hylton, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Methuen, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Raglan, L.
Rathmore, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Sherborne, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Suffield, L.
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.

LORD DAVEY said the Amendment to which he desired to draw their Lordships' attention was one which should be read with the next Amendment standing in his name on the Paper, and with their permission he proposed to state what he had to say on both Amendments at once. The Amendment had been put down at the request of some of his hon. friends in another place, where, through the force of circumstances, they had had no opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the Government. The question on which it was desired to obtain the views of the Government had, in fact, been partly answered by the Lord Chancellor. The committee which was to exercise the functions of renewing licences was an administrative body and not a Court. The Bill provided for rules being made by the quarter sessions with the approval of the Secretary of State providing for the mode of appointing the committee and the procedure of the committee. There were many persons interested in this Bill who were very anxious to have it more perfectly clear on the face of the Bill that the procedure of the committee would be the same as the procedure of brewster sessions exercising their licensing powers under the present law. Their Lordships were probably aware that it had recently been held in that House that brewster sessions, that was to say, the magistrates exercising the jurisdiction given to them by the Licensing Acts, were not a Court. Although they must exercise their discretion and powers in a judicial spirit they were not a Court. There was no litigation before them; there were no parties; any person might appear before them and state his objections to the proposed grant of a licence or renewal of a licence; and they might obtain their information not only from the evidence before them, but even from information not on oath and from their own personal knowledge of the neighbourhood and from other circumstances of a similar character. They were, therefore, not a Court. He had no doubt that as this Bill proposed this jurisdiction of brewster sessions under quarter sessions it meant that quarter sessions should exercise the same functions and in the same manner as brewster sessions now exercised them, and that there should be the same powers to persons to appear before them and make objections, and the same power of obtaining information which the brewster sessions themselves possessed under the other Licensing Acts. He was glad his noble friend took the same view of the Bill which he had ventured to express.

The doubt which had arisen arose in this way: that quarter sessions sitting on appeal from the licensing magistrates were undoubtedly a Court, and it was apprehended that when a report from the licensing magistrates went to quarter sessions that the jurisdiction would be assimilated to an appeal from the licensing magistrates. He was glad to learn that that was not the view of the Government, and he hoped pains would be taken to make it impossible for anybody afterwards to raise the question. The Bill provided for the procedure of committees to be settled by rules approved by the Secretary of State. He proposed to insert on page 5, line 5, after the word "committees," the words "except as hereinafter provided," and then he proposed at the end of the clause to add "Provided that the committee of quarter sessions on the consideration of any report of the justices of a licensing district shall have the same powers and, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall be subject to the same procedure as justices at a general annual licensing meeting." That would confine strictly the jurisdiction with regard to renewals on the report of magistrates. He did not tie himself to these words, but he did hope that the Government would allow something to be put into the Bill to set at rest the questions which had been raised and in which, he confessed, he did not share.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 5, after the word 'committees' to insert the words 'except as is hereinafter provided.'"—(*Lord Davey.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I regret to say I cannot advise the Government to accept the Amendment or any Amendment to that effect. My noble friend and I are quite agreed as to what the law is. There is no dispute between us there, and the proposal is to introduce words which it is supposed will make clearer that which I think is perfectly clear already by law, and if one is to begin to explain everything that is supposed to be the law already in order that nobody may misunderstand any question, I have some doubt as to the task which one is desired to undertake. There is nothing so bad for drafting Acts of Parliament as that idea, because when something is put in which is manifestly unnecessary, you will find the argument is: "Here it is already in the Act, then the Legislature must have had some other object in introducing this other point." I can honestly say that in my judicial experience I have had that argument put before me over and over again, and sometimes there seems to be something in it. Here, I confess, there is nothing in it at all, and the only result of the Amendment, I think, would be to produce confusion. What can be the difficulty? Here is the Act of Parliament which says this is to take the place of brewster sessions. The statute has made no difference in the functions, and it would be extremely difficult to define everything the Court has to do as judicial functions. The law is there as it was before. Why alter and begin to define and attempt to describe? That I think will only produce confusion? It may not be very familiar to your Lordships, but a Court of quarter sessions has power to find an indictment for high treason though practically such a question does not arise. So here the function is manifest and open. It is to do that which the brewster sessions used to do. What more do you want, and why do you want to introduce other words which make that which is already clear darkened by exposition? I think it would be a very great mistake if your Lordships were to proceed on these lines, and I hope the noble Lord will not proceed with his Amendment.

LORD **DAVEY** said he would point out to the Lord Chancellor that the section which he desired to amend provided for the procedure of the committee to be regulated by rules of quarter sessions. What he desired to provide was that the making of rules for the procedure of these committees should be qualified in the sense he had endeavoured to express by preserving for this particular function the procedure of the brewster sessions.

THE EARL OF **HALSBURY**: I cannot help thinking that this is worse and worse. I think you might presume that the magistrates in general would understand plain words, but my noble friend seems to think that we should guard the Secretary of State's procedure. I think the Secretary of State may be trusted to draft rules which would not interfere with the recognised rules of quarter sessions.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF **PORTSMOUTH** said that the object of his Amendment was to retain for the municipal boroughs with a population of over 25,000 the autonomous powers they already possessed as regards licensing. He confessed that he somewhat shared the view expressed by the noble Earl on the Woolsack that the amount of drunkenness did not depend solely and entirely upon the diminution of public-houses. That might or might not be a great object, but in dealing with any great question of temperance reform he thought it was very desirable also to bear in mind the question of administration. What was the position as regarded the existing comparison between county boroughs and non-county boroughs? The anomalies which existed and which would be perpetuated by this Bill were of an extraordinary character. There were certainly sixty municipal boroughs with a population of over 25,000, and some of these municipal boroughs whose jurisdiction would be taken away from them as regarded licensing under this Bill, like West Hartlepool, had a population of over 60,000, and there were several with a population of over 50,000. Perhaps, to show the extremely anomalous condition of things which would exist under the Bill as it now stood, he might take for example the county of Kent. For no reason that he could understand except that he believed his right hon. friend the Home Secretary was one of the Members for Kent, Canterbury had been made a county borough in the Local Administration Act of 1888. Canterbury had a population of 15,000, but Canterbury was to retain its own autonomous condition under this Bill. There was a place like Maidstone, which, he believed, was still the capital of the county, with a population of 33,000, and which did not happen to be a county borough. It was to be deprived of its brewster sessions; and there was another town of equal importance, the town of Rochester. He could not understand on what principle they were to deprive towns like Maidstone and Rochester of the right to deal with their own licensing affairs, whereas a city like Canterbury with a small population was by a mere accident to be allowed to retain that right. Another extraordinary thing existed regarding the inner towns of the county of Kent. There was the case of Tunbridge Wells. Part of it was in Kent and part in Sussex. Would part of the town be under the jurisdiction of the magistrates of quarter sessions for Sussex and part under the magistrates for Kent? It did seem to him to be a most extraordinary condition of things. But apart from what he might call the anomalies which existed under this Bill as it now stood, he thought that they ought to bear in mind the case of the very large and growing centres of population in Lancashire and Yorkshire. He thought it was the Bishop of London who had emphasised, and he thought with great force and power, the desire of some of these towns to show a public spirit in this matter. They wanted to make their towns clean and healthy in this respect, and the magistrates in these towns—most of them men acquainted intimately with the town, and townsmen themselves closely identified with the feelings of the town—had taken and did take the greatest interest in the welfare and prosperity of the town; and the social interests of the town especially connected with this matter of licensing, a matter which they had considered and which they felt they should be able to continue to take an interest in if this Bill passed into law. Southport and Blackpool had both applied to be made county boroughs, and he was afraid that the real reason why the Government had, as it were, excluded these non-county boroughs and taken away from them the brewster sessions was because they wanted them to pay for the diminution of licences in the country districts. That did seem to him to be a most unfair thing.

How did that practically apply? Figures had been given to him to show that under this Bill Scarborough would have to contribute a sum of over £2,000, but in return for that Scarborough would, he thought, receive towards its own fund a sum of about £700. That was to say, that the remaining two-thirds which was taken from Scarborough would be devoted towards the reduction of licences in the country districts. That seemed to him to be very unfair and very inequitable. He did not think the principle was a very wise one or a very just one, because many of these smaller licences in the country districts were really licences which were not of any value and which his experience rather tended to show did not lead to a great deal of harm. It was chiefly in the large towns where the licences were redundant, where it seemed to him that it was the duty of the magistrates to take great care to see that they were reduced. He referred not only to the case of young towns but to towns which were of a certain size and which were old towns. In all these cases the effect of the reduction of licences would be greatly hampered unless an Amendment of this kind were introduced. He hoped in regard to this matter the Government would be anxious to meet the views of the great municipal boroughs. He was quite sure that the support of the municipal boroughs to this Bill, if it became law, would be one which would be of great importance, and he could not conceive that anything would tend more to prejudice this Bill in the minds or in the sentiments of a large portion of English people, especially in some of the large counties in the North of England, than the taking away from them this privilege which they had so long enjoyed and which they still cherished very deeply indeed. He would most earnestly press this Amendment on the noble Lord in charge of the Bill, and he was sure Lord Belper would do him the justice of seeing that he did not press it in any Party spirit.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 18, after the word 'borough' to insert the words 'with a population of less than twenty-five thousand.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

LORD BELPER: I will not follow the noble Earl into some of the anomalies in regard to the numbers of the population of the county boroughs. No doubt there is some anomaly because there are some county boroughs which have existed for some period and which are not the big towns in England now. But there is no question with regard to the anomaly of population under this Bill, because it particularly specifies that they are to be boroughs over 25,000. This Amendment was made and was discussed at very considerable length in the other House. Not only that, but whenever any question has come up with regard to the administration of counties in a number of different Bills which have passed in late years, there have always been Motions with regard to these larger boroughs, and not only was there a Motion on this occasion with regard to 25,000, but since that Motion was proposed to make these 25,000 boroughs boroughs for the purpose of the Act, another Amendment was moved in the other House that the number should be 10,000, and, as a matter of fact, there was a feeling in certain of the big towns that they would prefer to have the management of their own affairs. But I should like to point out to the noble Earl that he is under some misapprehension with regard to what the Bill proposes to do. There is no proposal to take away the brewster sessions from these large towns. There is not the slightest intention of doing so. These towns which have their brewster sessions will have their brewster sessions just the same. What the proposal is, is that with regard to a scheme for compensation these towns will have, just as other districts of the county will have, the power of initiating proposals and the committee of quarter sessions will settle how the fund is to be eventually administered and what licences are to be reduced.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Take the case of Hull. Hull is to appeal to Beverley.

LORD BELPER: In the county boroughs there is an appeal to quarter sessions in the county, and we are limiting the powers of the county and not extending them in that direction, except that whereas there is an appeal in the case of misconduct that appeal will still be an appeal to quarter sessions of the county. But in the case where there is a reduction of licences on other ground than misconduct, the magistrates in their own borough will settle that matter, and so far from making the law less favourable to these boroughs, it is the very reverse. Might I point out that the noble Earl also assumes that if these boroughs are left as the Bill proposes, and if they are to be part of the county for the purpose of the compensation fund they will be treated unfairly and will not get their due proportion of reductions. Of course, in every case where the committee of quarter sessions has to decide, the circumstances will vary. What I should take it would be the procedure is that in those places where there is most necessity for reduction they are likely to get the largest reduction, and if in these big towns there is real necessity for reduction, so far from being damnified by being connected with the county, they will have the opportunity of getting part of the compensation fund that will go to the county as a whole, and thus will have an opportunity of getting a larger sum for their reductions. The fact of the matter is, the principle on which this Bill purposes to deal with this matter is to have the largest area possible within the county, and if you are going to cut up the counties into an enormous number of parts where there will be separate authorities, you will be acting in the opposite direction from that in which we have been urged to go by many experienced Members of the House. The principle I have heard put forward is that this should be a national Bill, and not a county Bill, and if you accept the Amendment you will make it a county borough Bill, and, so far as I can see, it will be a step in the wrong direction as far as the administration of the fund goes. It is a matter of great importance. There are no less than fifty-three boroughs with a population of over 25,000 which are affected by this Amendment, and in some of the populous counties it would go a long way to destroy the fund, because in Lancashire there are no less than eleven boroughs which would be affected by this particular Amendment. I hope in this House—I do not think there is any feeling in favour of boroughs or against boroughs. What I ask the House now to think of in dealing with this Amendment is what is the best way of administering this Bill. I am sure it would be a step in a retrograde direction if you were to cut up the areas which are already established by the Bill, make them smaller, and make the fund less useful for the purpose for which it was intended.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—

LORD MONKSWELL said that in moving this Amendment he would like to say, in the first place, that he did so in no unfriendly spirit to the City of London. He thought it desirable to say that because some noble Lords might know that he was a member, and a Progressive member, of the London County Council, and he knew that there was a feeling in that House that the Progressive members of the London County Council were extremely bitter and unfriendly towards the City of London. The noble Lord on the Woolsack shook his head, and he was glad to know the noble Lord was not of that opinion. He thought he had a special right to take the opinion of the House on the Amendment inasmuch as the matter was closured in the House of Commons. The only reason why he moved the Amendment was that it seemed to him that it was only just that the City of London should contribute towards the suppression of licences in the county of London. Under this Bill as it stood, if this sub-section were allowed to remain, the City of London would contribute probably nothing and certainly very little towards the suppression of licences in the whole county of London. That was a matter of considerable importance, because taking the county of London as a whole there was no doubt whatever that there were a large number, as the Bishop of London had stated, of redundant licences that ought to be suppressed, and if the City of London was not excluded from the purview of the Act and was not allowed to be a place by itself, the City of London, if the levy was made for the whole of the county, would contribute £25,000 towards the suppression of licences in the rest of the county of London. He thought the right rev. Prelate had made it perfectly clear that it was extremely desirable that not a single penny that could be obtained in the county of London for the suppression of licences should be abandoned. He ventured to think that the speech that they had just heard from the noble Lord in charge of the Bill, Lord Belper, showed that the Government ought to treat his Amendment very favourably, because the noble Lord had explained that the intention of the Government was that the areas for compensation should be as large as possible. He held that after the speech of the noble Lord it would hardly be possible for His Majesty's Government to suggest that the county of London ought not to be considered as a whole, and he thought he might take from what the noble Lord had said that he would hardly be in favour of this exclusion of the City of London.

Under the Bill as it stood the various county boroughs of London would have to contribute to the suppression of licences in London as a whole. The borough of Fulham, which had a very large and increasing population, and which probably would not have to provide a single penny for suppression of licences if it was excluded from the county of London, would have to provide compensation, under the Bill as it stood, for the boroughs of Shoreditch and Poplar, where the licences were very redundant, and the borough of Fulham was miles away from the borough of Shoreditch. But if they took the City of London, the public-houses of Shoreditch were near the City, but if the City was not to be under the necessity of providing compensation for the rest of London why should the borough of Fulham be obliged to provide compensation for the redundant public-houses in Shoreditch and Poplar? The Legislature had always declined to make the City of London a county borough. It was not a county borough. It was part of the county of London and the Legislature had recognised that. It had been provided that the City of London should send four members to represent the City in the London County Council, and in other matters the City of London had been very properly treated as part of the county of London. Under the Equalisation of Rates Act the City of London contributed towards the poor rates of the rest of London, and towards the education rates of the rest of London, although if the City were considered as an entity by itself it would hardly contribute anything to the education of London, inasmuch as there were no children in the City of London to educate. If they once exempted the City of London, why should they not exempt every single borough council? Why should not all the thirty borough councils within the radius of the administrative county of London be considered as separate entities for this purpose of compensation? The City of Westminster surely had as much right to be considered a separate entity, and if they once began this disintegration of London where were they to stop? This proposal seemed to be the first step in the disintegration of London as a whole.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 15, to leave out Sub-section (3)."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Lord has put forward this Amendment with a great deal of emphasis, and I really think that it does not deserve that emphasis. We cannot approach this question from a purely financial point of view. It is apparent from the provisions of the Bill and from the speeches of my noble friends on previous Amendments that we recognise that certain historical areas are treated, and are rightly treated, in a special manner. On the last Amendment the noble Earl Lord Portsmouth called attention to the method in which Canterbury would be treated by this Bill. I am quite aware that Canterbury is a relatively small city, but it has a great historical position, but not a greater historical position than the City of London, and I think Parliament has always been desirous of respecting the City of London, and of respecting its individuality. It is quite true, as the noble Lord has said, that the City of London is not a county borough in all senses of the term, but he carries his argument a great deal too far if he would have us believe that, although the City of London has not always been treated in an exceptional manner, it does not stand, as he seems to think, in a different position from the borough of Fulham. I submit that it is really a very great exaggeration to state that the City of London stands in no different position from the other boroughs of the Metropolis. It has its own police arrangements, that is an important matter. The whole control of its streets is invested in a city authority entirely distinct from the corresponding authorities in the other parts of London. I have no doubt you could put your finger on a great number of practices in which the City of London stands in a special position. I do not think we ought to interfere with the individuality of the City licensing arrangements. It is not at all true that they have not licences of their own with which they have to deal. They have licences of their own with which they have to deal, but these licensed houses are indeed very different from the kind of licensed houses with which it may be necessary to deal in other parts of London. They are for the most part a much more wealthy kind of restaurant than the public-house in the ordinary sense of the term; and therefore the City of London does not merely stand on a special footing historically, but, according to the circumstances of the case, it stands on a special footing, and therefore I think it would be a pity for us to take away the right of the City of London, which it has always claimed, of managing its licences for itself.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I am very loth to intervene in this debate, because it is tolerably evident that it is not much use to intervene in this debate, or to attempt to bring any conviction to the serried battalions that sit behind the Government. It has been my experience for nearly forty years, and I am not prepared to see it belied in any way by our experience in Committee to-night, but surely we are entitled to some rag or vestige of argument in support of the proposition for which the Peers in front of me are prepared meekly to vote when they are called upon to do so. What is the argument for exempting the City of London from the policy that is pursued over the rest of the Metropolis in respect of this Bill? The noble Lord who brought forward this Amendment showed very clearly and forcibly, as I think, that boroughs in London remote from places like Shoreditch, where there are many licensed houses which require suppression, will have to pay for the suppression of those houses, but that the City of London is to be exempt from any share of the common responsibility of the Metropolis. I must say that there was one phrase in my noble friend's speech with which I disagreed, in which he said it was the first step in the dislocation of the Metropolis as a whole, because the policy of the Party opposite has always been the dislocation of the Metropolis as a whole. What is the ground on which the City of London is to be exempted from the common bond of burden imposed on it in this temperance measure? It is because it is a historical city. From whom does that argument come? It comes from the High Bailiff of the

City of Westminster. Did he not recognise any exceptional historical position in the case of the City of Westminster? Is the position of the City of Westminster less dignified as compared with that of the City of London, that it does not deserve to be considered, but lumped in the common ruck of the county of London, while the City of London is to be set up on high for the suppression of those expensive restaurants to which the noble Marquess so feelingly referred? I think there is a limit to the contempt to which this House may be treated in point of argument. Canterbury, I suppose, is a historical city, because Thomas a'Becket is buried there. But why not Berwick-on-Tweed? It has been treated for many years past as a county town. It was ravaged from Scotland, not by war, not by force of arms, but by legislative enactment. Why is it not to be similarly exempted in the same fashion from the boroughs of its own county? I think we do deserve some better argument than has been put forward by the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal, for the exemption of the City of London; and I earnestly solicit that argument from the Government Bench.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," their Lordships divided: Contents, 91; Not-contents, 32.

CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Wellington, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Bathurst, E.
Bradford, E.
Cawdor, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Derby, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Drogheda, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lathom, E

Leven and Melville, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Lytton, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Powis, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.

Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Estcourt, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)
Forester, L.
Glanusk, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hylton, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Methuen, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Sherborne L.
Stalbridge, L.
Suffield, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Grafton, D.

Abercorn, M (*D. Abercorn.*)
Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.

Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Chichester, E.
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Spencer, E.
Temple, E.

Falmouth, V.

London, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.

Balfour, L.
Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]

The Earl of Rosebery.

Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Farrer, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Monkswell, L.
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Welby, L.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clause 8.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said that the reason why he proposed this Amendment was that a publican might say to a customer, "I will give you a cup of tea, but I will charge one shilling for it." That was a prohibitive price.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 22, after the word 'refreshment,' to insert the words 'at a reasonable price.'"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

Lord BELPER: I do not think there is any objection to those words being put in.

Earl BEAUCHAMP asked whether it would be possible to leave out the word "persistently."

Lord BELPER: I do not think we can do that.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

***The LORD ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY** said that his Amendment, if it were carried, would make the words of the clause run—

"If the justices of a licensing district refuse to renew an existing on-licence on the ground that the holder of the licence has persistently and unreasonably refused to supply suitable refreshment at a reasonable price (other than intoxicating liquor), or on the ground that the holder of the licence has failed to give or fulfil any reasonable undertaking required by or given to the justices on the grant or previous renewal of the licence, the justices shall be deemed to have refused the licence on the ground that the premises had been ill-conducted."

As the matter now stood, as far as he could see, all that the licensee had to do was to refuse to give any undertaking at all. If he neglected to fulfil an undertaking that he had given, he could be regarded as having placed himself in the position of justifying the magistrates in refusing his licence. If the magistrates desired to make a reasonable condition and the licensee refused, they could not regard him as coming into that category. It seemed to him that it should be in the power of the licensing bench to make these conditions. The condition, of course, must be a reasonable one; but if it was of a reasonable sort it seemed to him that it ought to be absolutely in the power of the magistrates to demand it, and he could not conceive that the Amendment which he suggested could do other than make the section of the Bill coherent.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 24, after the first word 'to,' to insert the words 'give or,' and after the word 'undertaking' to insert the words 'required by or'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

***The Earl of ONSLOW**: My Lords, I am rather sorry, I confess, that the most rev. Primate did not go more fully into the reasons why he asks your Lordships to accept this Amendment. So far as a new licence is concerned, of course there can be no possible objection whatever to the magistrates imposing any conditions that they like, reasonable or unreasonable, for the matter of that. But this Amendment proposes that a man's licence shall be forfeited, that the renewal shall be refused, if he declines to give a condition which, in the opinion of the magistrates, possibly subject to appeal to a Court of law, is reasonable.

A NOBLE LORD: Quarter sessions.

***The Earl of ONSLOW**: Well, the magistrates in quarter sessions. There is a practice which obtains at this moment of granting licences subject to certain conditions. That is not a practice which can be enforced in law; but of course the magistrates say to a man, "We will give your licence on condition that you do or do not do so-and-so." It is quite within the competence of the magistrate, when the licence comes up for renewal, to say, 'Oh, you have not observed the condition on which we granted your licence last year, and, therefore, we shall refuse to renew it." The man knows the conditions which are to be imposed, and he accepts them as being reasonable. What are the sort of conditions which are very constantly imposed on licences? One is not to sell beer on Sunday; that is to say, it is a six-days licence. In other cases he should not have the privilege of supplying *bona fide* travellers on Sunday. That is a condition which I believe exists in the licence which is given to the Zoological Garden. They obtain their licence on the condition that they will not serve anybody on Sunday. Then again it is even made a condition that when a man has got an on beer licence he should not apply for a full licence. These are the sort of conditions which, I take it, would be held to be reasonable conditions, which are enforced every day with the consent of the licensee. Now the most rev. Prelate proposes that these should be imposed on them without their consent by the magistrates, and, if they refuse to accept them, that the licence which has been regularly renewed to them for twenty or thirty years shall be refused, and no compensation whatever given. I cannot think your Lordships will look on that as an equitable proposal in the case of an old licence, though I quite admit, when you come to grant a new licence, the magistrates should have the right to propose any conditions they please.

The LORD ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY gave as an illustration of the necessity for the Amendment the case of publicans who, as in Liverpool some years ago, bribed children to come to their houses by giving them sweets. A notice was served on all the publicans that this custom, which was very prevalent, should come to an end. There was some difficulty, but the magistrates succeeded, because it was a condition which it was then in their absolute power to enforce. If such a condition were laid down now, as suggested, the licensee would simply refuse to listen to it, and the magistrates would not be able to refuse his licence unless they gave full compensation. That seemed to be the kind of reason the noble Lord asked for.

The Earl of Onslow.

LORD FARRER mentioned a case that occurred to himself in a town with which the noble Earl was very well acquainted. Two or three years ago he happened to be rowing up the river, and they came to a public-house where they asked for tea. They were told they could not have tea, but they could have spirits. He asked for biscuits, and they were refused. He wrote to the justices' clerk, who insisted that this publican should supply proper refreshments. He did not gather that, unless this Amendment were agreed to, that could be done under the Bill, but he might be wrong.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think the noble Lord is wrong, and if he reads the section he will see that. It does not do to interpret one small act as being so fatal as to put the licensee in danger of losing his licence. But if he persistently followed such a course as has been described he would be liable to be judged as misconducting himself, and become liable to all the penalties. With regard to the instance of the most rev. Primate, there, again, I do not entertain the least doubt that the case of a publican who enticed little children into the public-house would be a case of misconduct within the meaning of the first clause. These two instances really illustrate the reason why we cannot accept the Amendment. All such matters as are suggested are already covered by the Bill as we propose it. But there are other matters which do not involve misconduct, and these, we think, ought not to be imposed. We think these should be matters suggested to the licensee, and, if he undertakes to do what is suggested, I think that undertaking should be enforced. But we do not think that we can exalt these conditions into grounds for refusing a licence.

EARL SPENCER: I hope the Government will consider the proposition of the most rev. Primate. So far as I understand the Bill, it most materially deprives magistrates of the disciplinary power they had before. They will not be in a stronger position when they can only recommend what they want to the licensing committee, and not act themselves. Everybody who understands the Bill is clearly of that opinion, as far as I know. An immense deal has been done to the disciplinary power of the magistrate, which, we think, will be diminished; and what the most rev. Primate proposes is to try to give back some of that power, which is a very beneficial power, into the hands of the magistrates. This it is very desirable they should hold in many respects. My Lords, I do not mean to go at length into this matter, but I believe at Liverpool there was a most remarkable instance of what the magistrates did, not by threatening to withdraw licences, but really by the licence-holders and others knowing what power they had. They were able, as the law then stood, to do a great deal which a great many people who have studied the Bill think they will not be enabled now to carry out. Therefore, I hope the Government will take into account this Amendment of the most rev. Primate, which I think would be of great interest and value for the sake of morality and good conduct in towns.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I cannot understand why it has been said in this debate that the disciplinary power of the magistrates is lessened. There is no such limit in the Bill at all. The power to punish by withdrawing a licence for misconduct remains what it was before. My very strong objection is that you are leaving now some very uncertain powers in the hands of magistrates, and I think it is for their sake as well as for the sake of the persons who are to have this jurisdiction exercised over them, that these very uncertain and unnecessary powers should not be granted. Take one example; suppose a magistrate was to say, "I will not grant a licence unless you undertake your house is not tied." Some people may think that is a reasonable condition, but it is giving them power beyond the law, and I think it ought not to be allowed. You ought to have definite rules. You ought to have something that can be recognised as misconduct by everybody. I think it would be a very undesirable thing to give this jurisdiction to magistrates, exposing them to very unfavourable comment if they do not take advantage of the fad of any particular neighbourhood.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY asked the Lord Chancellor whether the expression "ill-conducted" would cover such a case as he had referred to, in which the house, being well-conducted in other respects, was in the way of bribing children with sweets.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: The difficulty I have in replying is that the expression has not sufficiently explained itself. If the most rev. Prelate means coaxing children by sweets to indulge in spirits or beer, I should not have the smallest doubt; but if it is merely giving children sweets, I should not think that is misconduct.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said he was sorry to prolong the conversation, but to make it quite clear, he would point out that the particular offence that was at that time practised by the publicans in question was to entice children, at a time before the Child Messenger Bill had passed, to go to their house rather than another house to fetch beer, and necessarily to find that house a happy place wherein to spend their time. In short, the system was to endeavour to get children within the walls of the public-house, the specific purpose being that it was profitable to the publican rather than advantageous to the child.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY moved to leave out the word "previous" in Sub-section 2 of Clause 8.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 25, to leave out the word 'previous.'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: There is no objection to that.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said he would move, in a slightly altered form, the Amendment which stood in the name of the Earl of Rosslyn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 27, after the words 'ill-conducted,' to insert the words 'provided that where the justices, on an application for the renewal of an existing on-licence, ask the licence-holder to give an undertaking as aforesaid, they shall adjourn the hearing of the application, and cause notice of the required undertaking to be served upon the registered owner of the premises, and give him an opportunity of being heard.' "—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: We have no objection to these words as amended. We could not have accepted them as on the Paper; but as the noble Earl has moved them we have no objection.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE EARL OF CARLISLE, in moving the Amendment which stood in the name of Viscount Peel, said that it was a very important one, because it did that which they had been frequently told the Bill was intended to do. It assimilated the ante-1869 beerhouses to other licensed houses. Clause 1 of this Bill abolished the old four grounds that affected 1869 beerhouses, but the effect of Clause 9 was to revive the four grounds on which alone the justices could refuse renewal. By the sub-section as it stood the old 1869 beerhouses would regain privileges which the first clause of this Bill struck out, and the consequence was the Bill did nothing whatever to the 1869 beerhouses, except to give the quarter sessions committee the power of buying them out. Other licensed houses could be refused renewal at present for structural disqualifications, but this privileged set of houses might be as structurally unfit as possible and yet their licences could not be refused on that ground. The clause protected these houses for no reason that could be conceived. This Bill had been praised again and again, and great deficiencies had been justified on the ground that it dealt with the 1869 beerhouses. It was quite true it did that, but it replaced them in their original position by this clause. He hoped the Government would see their way to meet them on that clause, because, as it stood, it reduced the Bill to an absurdity. It should, however, be understood that without the Bill these ante-1869 beerhouse licences had been reduced from 49,130 in 1869 to 27,874 in 1904 by the latest return; so that unless the assimilation, which he proposed, was effected, it was difficult to see what could be gained by the Bill on this point.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 30, to leave out from the word 'repealed' to the end of the sub-section."—(*The Earl of Carlisle.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The effect of the Amendment is to place the ante-1869 beerhouses in the same position as other public-houses for all purposes. I think the noble Earl will see the reason why the Government are not willing to accept the Amendment. The law provides that ordinary public-house licences which do not belong to this category can be taken away for a great variety of reasons without compensation; but in the case of the ante-1869 beerhouses they can be taken away only for four causes, which are enumerated in the Act of Parliament. Well, my Lords, if this Amendment were passed, it would follow that the ante-1869 beerhouse licences might be taken away without compensation for those causes for which the ordinary public-houses can be deprived of their licences, and which are not included amongst the four which specially apply to the ante-1869 houses. That, my Lords, we think would be a breach of the Parliamentary title under which the ante-1869 beer houses are held. But we do not think that the ante-1869 beer-houses should be imposed for all time on the community; on the contrary, it is one of the advantages of the Bill that we deal for the first time with these beerhouses. We allow them to be taken away for the causes I have mentioned, but which are not enumerated amongst these four specially prescribed in the case of the ante-1869 beerhouses, but with compensation. The difference between their title and the title of the ordinary public-house will be represented in the amount of compensation they will receive. By this method no injustice will be done to the ante-1869 beerhouses, and yet they will be brought within the control of the magistrates in a way in which they have never been before, and will be removable even for other reasons than the four prescribed. But, of course, if the magistrates go outside these four prescribed reasons, they will be obliged to provide the compensation which is directed by the Act. These are the reasons why we cannot accept this Amendment. It would, contrary to the policy of the Government, break the Parliamentary title under which these ante-1869 beerhouses are held. At the same time we think we have provided a sufficient means of controlling these beerhouses which, we submit, is better than that which the noble Lord recommends.

*THE EARL OF CARLISLE said that the Parliamentary title of these houses was the same as that of the full public-house licence. The pre-1869 off beer licences had already been abolished without compensation in 1882, and he never understood that there was a difference in the Parliamentary title between the off beer licences and the on licences.

Earl SPENCER: I think it will be a great misfortune if these licences are not to be under the same regulations as other licences. All the difference in the world is made by the fact that they will now receive compensation.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: No, my Lords. In the Amendment of the noble Earl, he proposes in certain cases that they should be suppressible, if I may use that word, without compensation. That is exactly the point of his Amendment.

*THE EARL OF CARLISLE: If the premises are structurally unfit, the ante-1869 beer licences should be suppressible like other licences.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: But outside the Act of Parliament.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," their Lordships divided—Contents, 91; Not-Contents, 27.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.
Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Cholmondeley, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Pembroke and Montgomery, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Bathurst, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chichester, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Derby, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Drogheda, E.
Feversham, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lathom, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Lytton, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Powis, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selborne, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Wharncliffe, E.
Yarborough, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Falmouth, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Sidmouth, V.

Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Balfour, L.
Barnard, L.
Belper, L.
Burnham, L.
Burton, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)
Forester, L.
Glanusk, L.
Glenesk, L.
Hampton, L.
Hylton, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Methuen, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L
Ormathwaite, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Suffield, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Ripon, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Spencer, E.

Temple, E.

London, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. David's, L. Bp.

Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Farrer, L.
Hatherton, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Monkswell, L.

Monteagle of Brandon, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Welby, L.

*THE MARQUESS OF BRISTOL said that his noble friend Lord Zouche of Haryngworth was unable to be present, and he had asked him to look after his Amendment. He himself had an Amendment on the Paper very nearly in identical terms, but he preferred the form of his noble friend. He proposed that the eastern and western divisions of Sussex and Suffolk should each be deemed a county for the purposes of this Act. He wished to ask their Lordships to adopt the Amendment so as to bring these two counties into the four corners of the Bill. He understood, from conversation he had had with Lord Onslow, that it was contrary to the practice of Parliament by a public Bill to interfere with any rights of quarter sessions. His answer to that was that for hundreds of years in the case of Suffolk, and he dared say for a very long period in the case of Sussex, the practice had invariably been in the opposite direction, and there was nothing novel in what they were asking for. They were only asking that the invariable practice and custom of the counties should be confirmed. On the merits of the question he might mention that it had invariably been the case both in Sussex and Suffolk that the quarter sessions had dealt with licensing questions including licensing appeals. He was aware that there was a proviso which would enable them to go to the Home Office and ask for an Order, but these two or three words which he proposed would save the justices the trouble of making an application to the Home Secretary and the Home Secretary the trouble of answering the application. He thought their Lordships would perceive that he was asking nothing unreasonable.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 39, after the word 'sessions' to insert the words 'provided that the eastern and western divisions of Sussex and Suffolk shall each be deemed a county for the purposes of this Act.'"—(*The Marquess of Bristol.*)

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: The last few words of the speech of the noble Marquess seemed to me to suggest to your Lordships that, in order to save the quarter sessions of the counties of Sussex and Suffolk from proceeding under the Bill in the same way that every quarter sessions are to proceed, they should have a special clause put in to enable them to do that which they could perfectly well do under the Bill. That seems to me altogether unnecessary, and to rest on a misapprehension as to what can and cannot be done in the two counties in which the noble Marquess is interested. May I ask the noble Marquess to look at Clause 8, Sub-section 4, which says that "where quarter sessions have customarily been held separately by adjournment or otherwise for any part of a county as defined by this Act, the Secretary of State may by Order, on the application of the justices sitting at each such separate sessions, constitute for the purposes of this Act any part of the county for which quarter sessions are for the time being so separately held a separate county." Well, if the two parts of Suffolk wish to be constituted separate quarter sessions areas they have powers by applying to the Secretary of State, but if either of those counties are unwilling to be created into separate portions then I think it would be most improper for Parliament, against their will and without hearing them, to compel them. I think I have shown that the object the noble Marquess wishes to attain can be attained under the Bill, and I cannot see any reason for exempting these two counties from the operations which are provided generally for all counties.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted."

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: The Contents have it.

*THE MARQUESS OF BRISTOL: I must trouble your Lordships to divide because I am in the nature of a baillie for Sussex.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I waited for a challenge but heard none.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I am bound to say I heard my noble friend challenge, but I hope he will not persist in it. May I say that he may take my assurance that there is the power to do that which he requires under the Bill, and in the interpretation clause the word "county" includes every part or division of a county.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY moved the following Amendment: Page 7, line 21, after "persons" insert "or may be transferred or removed to any other premises under Section 14 of the Alehouse Act, 1828, or Section 50 of the Licensing Act, 1872." The noble Marquess said: This Amendment is in order to remove a doubt. We do not think, as a matter of fact, that there ought to be any doubt that a removal does not involve that the licence should be a new licence—the renewal of a licence on removal does not involve that it should be a new licence, but there has been just an atom of doubt thrown on the point, and in order to insure that the removal does not make a new licence, we propose to insert these words

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 21, after the word 'persons' to insert the words 'or may be transferred or removed to any other premises under Section 14 of the Alehouse Act, 1828, or Section 50 of the Licencing Act, 1872.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF CREWE said before these words were inserted, as he supposed they would be, he desired to make one or two observations upon the Amendment. It was one of the Amendments of a very innocent appearance, as several had been described, which had an extremely far-reaching effect. So far as he was able to judge, it seemed certain that Clause 4, upon which they on that side of the House had looked with great satisfaction, would have its effect very largely reduced indeed by the insertion of these apparently innocent words. In Clause 4, as their Lordships were aware, the monopoly value of a licence was handed over to the public, and taken away from the licence, but in these cases of transfer the monopoly value of course remained as before in the hands of the licence-holder. What he desired to point out to their Lordships was that there had been, and doubtless would be in the future, a great number of cases where these transfers were in all practical sense and meaning the grant of new licences. A licence would now be, of course, an even more valuable possession than it had hitherto been, all old licences would be most jealously and carefully preserved, and they would be preserved now with all the greater attention, in order to remove them from places where they had not been very valuable to places where they would become exceedingly valuable. After these harmless-looking transfers had been effected, they would not merely retain an old monopoly value, but would acquire an absolutely new monopoly value which they would maintain in permanence. It was a little surprising that this Amendment, which was of a far-reaching character, should be imposed upon them at that stage. They did not propose to ask their Lordships to divide against it. That would be a useless task, he feared, but certainly they were not disposed to allow it to pass without a protest. The insertion, he was bound to say, of Clause 4 by His Majesty's Government, holding the views they did, had caused some surprise in some quarters, and he could only assume that the objection taken to Clause 4, possibly by certain members of His Majesty's Government, had unfortunately caused them to whittle down the operation of the clause by the insertion of this most mischievous Amendment.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think the noble Earl is under a misapprehension. As I understand him, he desires to raise the old question as to whether transfers should be placed on the same footing as renewals under the Act. I beg to say we are long past the part of the Bill in which that was done, which was in the beginning of Clause 8, and the word "transfer" in the Amendment I am moving is, as I apprehend, of quite a different character. The point here is not the transfer from one licence-holder to another, but the transfer of a licence from one set of premises to another set of premises. I am sure the one which the noble Earl had in his mind is an earlier one.

THE EARL OF CREWE: By no means.

The MARQUESS of SALISBURY: This is a relatively small matter, and that is much more important. For example, a licensed house is burned down. That is no reason why, because the house has been burned down, all the conditions of a new licence should be imposed. The licence must be removed to another building, and that appears to be a perfectly fair and equitable arrangement. I merely give that as an instance, and therefore I hope the noble Earl will not consider this as a matter of importance.

EARL GREY said he would give another instance. The noble Marquess had given an instance of one kind of case. Supposing the owner of a licensed house obtained the transfer on removal from a congested slum in a town or county to a perfectly new area. That was absolutely equivalent to a new licence of a very great value, and it was to protest against that the noble Earl spoke, and the only part he heard with dismay was that in which he said he was not going to divide. He did hope the noble Earl would divide on this Amendment.

LORD DAVEY said it was rather astounding that this Amendment, which practically converted what would otherwise be a new licence into an old licence, with all the privileges which this Bill for the first time enacted, and to the prejudice of the public, should be treated as a mere drafting Amendment. He presumed to differ from the noble Marquess. He (Lord Davey) thought that the first sub-section of Clause 8 dealt with a totally different thing—"The provisions of this Act shall apply to the transfer of an on-licence as they apply to the renewal of an on-licence." That meant, as he understood it, those cases where on the death of a licence-holder, or on the licence-holder giving up a public-house and wishing to transfer it to another licence-holder, a transfer took place. It applied only to transfers of that character, and speaking for himself, though of course he might be mistaken, the only transfer which was spoken of in the noble Marquess's present Amendment was the transfer of a totally different character, which could only be done under the express provisions of a particular case—that was to say, the transfer of the licence which was attached to certain premises in one place to premises in another place. That was a transfer of a totally different character from that which was mentioned in Sub-section 1 of Section 8, the transfer from one person to another. The question they were discussing now, and which was raised by the Amendment of the noble Marquess, was transfer from one licensed premises to another premises which stood on a totally different footing. That could only be done under Section 14 of the Alehouse Act, which required very special conditions to exist. He had not the Act by him, but he was quite certain that the conditions were of a very special character and only related to a very special class of case. The transfer under the section of the Licensing Act of 1872 was of a large character, and enabled a person to get his licence transferred from one premises to another premises with the consent of the licensing authority to the second premises. Under the old law that was perfectly immaterial. It was quite immaterial whether the transfer from certain premises, say, from Worthing to Brighton, was a transferred licence or whether it was a new licence granted in Brighton. Now, under the old licence, they received under the Act an extremely advantageous and privileged position, which made all the difference in the world. If a man found that the trade at his licensed premises was dwindling in one place and the premises were no longer required in that place, he could promptly transfer himself to another town or village within the same county, and claim the privileges of the old licence for his new premises. That was like a question of ancient lights: a man hung out a notice that he had ancient lights, and nobody could touch them. So with an holder of an old licence on certain premises: it gave him the right to warn people off from any infringement of his licence, although he transferred it to other premises. This seemed to him to be a most important Amendment. But for this Amendment he believed that a man would have to obtain a new licence if he transferred his business from one town or one village within the county to another village or town within the county, and he would have no higher rights or privileges than those which belonged to a new licence; but if he could transfer his old licence from one town or village to another town or village within the county or the quarter sessions district, at any rate he would obtain for his new public-house, which was in all essentials and in all respects a perfectly new public-house, all the benefits and privileges which by this Act were annexed to an old public-house.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY hoped the noble Marquess or some other member of the Government would be able in some way to reassure their Lordships on this subject. The noble Marquess treated it as a small matter, but it appeared to him one of the gravest changes they could introduce in the Bill. If the interpretation he (the most rev. Primate) put upon this Amendment were true, it would practically mean that no one who could help it would apply for a new licence, but everybody would apply for a "removal," for the reason that he would thus escape the new obligations imposed by Clause 4 on new licences. Their Lordships would remember that there were two quite different Acts relating to such "transfers" or "removals." There was first the Act of 1828 under which the cases on which a removal could be justified were such things as the burning down of a house, and under that Act the "removal" could only take place within the same licensing district. But there was absolutely no restriction under the Act of 1872 as to the grounds on which the renewal might be sanctioned, and it might be a removal to any other part of the county—that was to say, those who held a great many licences, instead of asking for a new licence which would be placed under the severer conditions now imposed, would ask for the transfer by removal, which would give them all the opportunities of escaping the obligations they had heard so much of under Clause 4. If that were so, the change might be good or bad (he himself thought it was exceedingly bad) but at all events it was a very great thing to do, and it seemed to him to take away the merits they had heard so much belauded under Clause 4. He might be making some mistake, but in that case he hoped to be set right.

LORD BURGHCLERE said he interposed with very small hopes of his suggestion being accepted by the Government. But if, as he had not the slightest doubt, the most rev. Primate was right in what he said with regard to the Acts of Parliament mentioned in the Amendment of the noble Marquess, he would suggest to the Government that they should strike out the words "or Section 50 of the Licensing Act, 1872," and the Amendment would be very much improved. Under the Alehouse Act of 1828, as had been pointed out, there were certain specific conditions by which the transfer might be made in these circumstances, but by Section 50 of the Act of 1872, as he was informed, they might be transferred without any conditions whatever. If His Majesty's Government would strike out those words he thought it would not be so necessary for them to make a protest against the Amendment. He ventured respectfully to commend the suggestion to the noble Marquess, though he was bound to say that, with the experience the House had had, he had not the slightest hope of it being accepted.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am very much surprised at the amount of attention which has been directed against this Amendment, which I really did think, quite candidly and frankly, was a very innocent Amendment, and I am still inclined to think it is, but as the most rev. Primate and noble Lords opposite have told us they consider the matter of very great importance, I should not like to press it upon the House at this moment. I therefore engage, on behalf of the Government, to look into it very carefully, and hope to be able to persuade the House at a future stage to adopt it, or some part of it; but I will not press it at the present moment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In line 28, after the word 'licence' to insert as a new paragraph the words 'The expression "transfer" means a transfer under Section four or fourteen of the Alehouse Act, 1828.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9:—

THE EARL OF **WEMYSS** moved an Amendment of page 7, line 31, after "1902" insert "(3) This Act shall come into operation on the first day of January, 1905." The noble Earl said the object of the Amendment was simply that the Act should not become operative until 1st January, 1905.

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 31, after the words ('1902') to insert the words '(3.) This Act shall come into operation on the first day of January one thousand nine hundred and five.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

THE MARQUESS OF **SALISBURY**: This Amendment is clearly necessary. We require a short time in order to get things in proper order before the Act can come into force, and, of course, we accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, as amended.

The House then resumed.

LORD **BALFOUR** OF **BURLEIGH**: My Lords, the Licensing Bill has gone through the Committee to which your Lordships referred same and I am directed to report it to your Lordships. with Amendments.

THE MARQUESS OF **SALISBURY**: I beg to move that the Standing Committee be negatived.

On Question, Standing Committee negatived.

The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 183.)

*THE **SECRETARY** OF **STATE** FOR **FOREIGN AFFAIRS** (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): It may be convenient that we should take the Report stage of this Bill as the first order on Monday, and if that meets the convenience of noble Lords, I will give notice to move the suspension of the Standing Orders.

EARL **SPENCER**: I think that would be the much better course.

ARMY COUNCIL BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

*THE **UNDER-SECRETARY** OF **STATE** FOR **WAR** (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE) moved the Third Reading of the Army Council Bill. He said: As a result of the consideration we have been able to give to two points raised in Committee, I am glad to be able to meet the noble Lords opposite on one of those points. As regards the first point raised by Lord Monkswell, namely, the insertion of the words "as such" after "Secretary of State for War," I am convinced that the insertion of the words would make the Act quite unworkable.

I have been carefully through some of the principal Acts concerned—the Army Act, Militia Act, and the Reserve Forces Act—and I find that in none of these is the Secretary of State mentioned as "the Secretary of State for War," but as "a Secretary of State," and therefore if we were to insert the words "as such" it would exclude all the most important Acts concerned with the Army from the purview of this Bill. But I think your Lordships will see, on looking at the words of the clause "all statutory powers and duties which at the date of the passing of this Act are exercised by the Secretary of State for War," that there is really not any likelihood of any abuse arising. As regards the point raised by the noble Marquess Lord Ripon, I was able to discuss this matter with him this evening and at his suggestion I am quite ready to insert after the words "Army Council," "including the Secretary of State for War and the Under-Secretary of State for War." If you will allow me, I shall be glad to move that as a privilege Amendment.

On Question, "That the Bill be read a third time," resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read 3ª (according to order); an Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at half-past Eleven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 5th August, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S INDISPOSITION.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker owing to indisposition. Whereupon Mr. James William Lowther, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]. (King's Consent signified), Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Trafford Park Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [Lords]. As amended. considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; a Clause added; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 220 and 246, relating to Private Bills, be suspended for the remainder of the Session.

Ordered, That as regards Private Bills to be returned by the House of Lords with Amendments such Amendments (if unopposed) be considered forthwith.

Ordered, That as regards Private Bills returned, or to be returned, by the House of Lords with Amendments such Amendments (if opposed) shall be considered at such times as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine.

Ordered, That when it is intended to propose any Amendments thereto, a copy of such Amendments shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office, and notice given on the day on which the Bill shall have been returned from the Lords.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*).

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Blyth, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Bolton, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Honiton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petition from East Ham, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (EXPORTATION) (UNITED KINGDOM AND CONTINENTAL COUNTRIES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th July; *Mr. Crombie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 313.]

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings at the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under The Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, 16th June, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3246 and 3247 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BRAZIL (No. 1, 1904).

Copy presented, of Award of His Majesty the King of Italy with regard to the Boundary between the Colony of British Guiana and the United States of Brazil [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Disturbances at Temperance Meetings at Dudley.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the methods adopted to break up public temperance meetings at Dudley on the 20th and 21st July; and whether he will ascertain if the police are taking any, and, if so, what, steps to prevent a repetition of such conduct.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have been in communication in this matter with the chief constable of Worcester, who is the authority responsible for the action taken by the police. It appears, from his report, that the disturbances at the meetings referred to were caused partly by the provocative language of the speakers and partly by the action of two holders of public licences, and he informs me that the Mayor of Dudley has withdrawn his permission for further meetings to be held in the Vegetable Market; and that, if the further inquiries he is making show that it is necessary, he will report the conduct of the licence-holders who took part in causing the disturbance to the licensing justices.

Compensation to Sorters in East Central Section of General Post Office for Loss of Overcoats.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received memorials from certain sorters of the East Central section of the General Post Office requesting compensation for the loss of overcoats stolen from the official retiring rooms during November and December, 1903, and February, 1904; and whether a decision has yet been arrived at in the matter.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Complaints were received during the period mentioned from certain sorters in the Eastern Central section of the General Post Office of the loss of articles of private clothing, and special inquiry was made in each case, but unfortunately without result. It is not the practice to give compensation in such cases. I regret that the officers in question were not informed to this effect at the time.

Payment of Cottagers for Boarded-Out Children.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the cottagers who receive children boarded out by boards of guardians, through the agencies of committees, require to be paid weekly, while the advances made to the committees are only three-quarters of the total amount required for such purpose for a given period, and that the remaining quarter is often not paid for some weeks after it is wanted by the committees to pay the cottagers; and, if so, whether, in view of the inconvenience resulting to these committees in consequence, he proposes to take any, and, if so, what, steps to provide a remedy.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have received representations on this subject. I propose to make certain amendments in the Boarding-Out Order, and in connection with them I hope to make some provision which will remove the inconvenience referred to by my right hon. friend.

Care of Orphan Children and Destitute Poor by Egyptian Government.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a report as to the provision made by the Egyptian Government for the care and housing of orphan children and the destitute poor, has yet been received; and, if not, will he state the cause of the delay.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) Lord Cromer has reported that the Mussulman religious foundations in Egypt dispose of considerable revenues for the maintenance of the poor and aged, and large sums are granted yearly by the Mussulman Benevolent Society. There is also a foundling home which receives children irrespective of creed, and the various religious communities have funds devoted to the relief of their poor. There is, at present, no need of any further institutions of this character.

Parochial Medical Officers (Scotland) Return—Alleged Inaccuracies.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the Return, Parochial Medical Officers (Scotland), is inaccurate in stating that the post of medical officer for Harris was vacant only once during the seven years prior to 1903, inasmuch as Dr. Macdonald was appointed to North Harris early in 1897, and during the end of 1898 Dr. Fletcher was appointed, in South Harris a Birmingham doctor was appointed to succeed Dr. Robinson in 1898, and Dr. Fraser was appointed in 1900; and will he take steps to have the accuracy of the Return tested, in so far as Barra and South Uist are concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Local Government Board have communicated with the inspector of poor of Harris in regard to the Return of Medical Officers furnished by him, and they find that, since July, 1896, there has been a change in the medical officership of South Harris five times and in that of North Harris twice. It appears that there has been some misunderstanding as to the meaning of the Return. The inspector explains that he understood the inquiry to mean the number of times that the parish was without a medical officer, and did not regard as vacancies those occasions on which one medical officer succeeded another without an interval of time. The Board are inquiring into the details of the Returns received from Barra and South Uist.

Fires caused by Sparks from Locomotives.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the injury caused to vegetation and crops on the sides of railways by the fires proceeding from engine sparks; and, if so, whether he will communicate with the railway companies and urge them to adopt whatever measures may tend to the diminution of such injuries.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) My right hon. friend has asked the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to reply to this Question. Our attention has frequently been called to cases in which vegetation and crops have been injured by fire arising from sparks and cinders emitted by railway locomotives. It is clearly the duty of the companies concerned to do everything that is practicable to prevent occurrences of the kind, and our view has always been that it would be in the interest of the companies themselves to deal in a liberal and equitable spirit with any claims for damages which may be presented to them. We have, however, no statutory powers in the matter, and it is doubtful whether any advantage would be gained by our issuing any circular or other communication to the companies at the present time. My noble friend will, however, be happy to give further consideration to the suggestion.

Rule of the Road at Sea—Single Vessels and Squadrons of Warships.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the President of the Board of Trade were the Board of Trade advisory circulars of April, 1897, and July, 1900, whereby British mariners are warned that when single ships are approaching a squadron of warships so as to involve risk of a collision, it would be in the interests of safety to keep out of the way of, and avoid passing through, a squadron; do the notices apply to a single ship authorised and enjoined by the rule of the road at sea to hold her course, and do they advise her not to do that in this case; is the rule as to keeping out of the way different for a single ship in a squadron from that for a single ship not in a squadron; and, if not, will the Board of Trade communicate with the Admiralty in order to remove any misunderstanding, and will it issue a further notice to make it clear that the rule of the road at sea applies to all ships alike, whether in squadron or not.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) (1.) The notices are advisory, and their object is to induce masters of British ships to keep so far from squadrons as to avoid all possibility of collision. (2,) The notices do not in any way alter or modify the regulations, which must be adhered to in any case, in which ships approach each other so as to involve any risk of collision. (3.) The Board of Trade understand that the Admiralty concur in this interpretation of the notice, and they do not think it necessary to take further action.

Scotch Education—Equivalent Grant.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in view of the loss of the Education Bill, he now proposes to utilise the Equivalent Grant (1903) for education instead of the rating relief.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I apprehend the hon. Member refers to the General Aid Grant appearing in the Estimates for 1904–5. That grant is already regulated by Minute, of date 25th April, 1904. It is true that payments under the provisions of that Minute will not exhaust the whole grant, it having been intended that the balance should be dealt with under the Bill. That balance will require to be dealt with next session, either by Bill or by Minute lying on the Table of the House, and will be so dealt with according to the legislative progress of next session. But it is not possible to deal with it now, nor can I accept as accurate the statement that the money already disposed of was given in rating relief.

Government Borrowings—Fall in Consols.

MR. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been called to the fact that the proposed issue of Exchequer Bonds has occasioned a fall in the price of Consols; and whether any further borrowings, other than those already announced, are in contemplation by the Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have observed the recent fall in the price of Consols. I do not anticipate that it will be necessary to make an issue of Exchequer Bonds under the provisions of the two Bills now before the House before November next, and it is not anticipated that the amount to be raised in this way during the current financial year will exceed six or seven millions. There are no further borrowings now in contemplation beyond those already authorised and the usual temporary borrowings to supply the needs of the Exchequer pending the receipt of revenue.

Royal Irish Constabulary—Age Limit Retirement.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state under what circumstances members of the Royal Irish Constabulary holding the rank of head constables and sergeants, stationed in county Down, are permitted to remain in the service for a period extending over the completion of their full service; and whether, in the interest of the public service, he will cause inquiry to be made with the view of having such men to retire forthwith.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The power vested in the Inspector-General, by Act of Parliament, to compulsorily retire members of the force under the rank of district inspector after they have completed twenty-five years service, is exercised only in cases of inefficiency or for some other sufficient reason, and not on account of length of service alone.

Police and Testimony as to Character of Prisoners.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the conviction of a man who was charged recently at Newcastle, county Down, with being drunk and disorderly and assaulting the police, and was fined in £2 with 8s. compensation; and to the fact that Head Constable Smith wrote a letter testifying to the good character of the person convicted; and, if so, will he say if this action is in accordance with police regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am informed that the accused was an entire stranger at Newcastle, and that the head constable, who had known him for sixteen years, wrote a letter to the effect stated. It is the constant practice to examine constables as witnesses to character in criminal Courts, and they are bound to give to the Court the assistance of their testimony if appealed to by the accused. The head constable would have acted more regularly, however, had he attended as a witness for the accused before the magistrates; but such letters as this are often written by others. There is no regulation in the force prohibiting the course taken, and, at worst, the head constable was only guilty of a very trifling indiscretion.

Religious Denomination of Poor Law Officials in Armagh.

Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that all the officials in Armagh, with one exception, are Protestants, notwithstanding the fact that a majority of the ratepayers and inmates are Catholics; and, if so, whether he will instruct the Local Government Board not to sanction the appointment of any other Protestant until such time as at least half-a-dozen Catholic officials are appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Board has no information in respect of the religious denominations of Poor Law officials, with the exception of chaplains of workhouses and of nuns employed in the capacity of matron, schoolmistress, or nurse in various workhouse infirmaries. Questions of religion are not considered by the Board in determining whether its sanction shall be given or withheld in the case of an appointment other than that of chaplain. The reply to the second inquiry is, therefore in the negative.

Female Catholic Teacher in Armagh Union.

Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Armagh Board of Guardians granted a pension of £9 a year to Miss M'Kee, a Catholic assistant teacher, which the Local Government Board refused to sanction; that she was afterwards dismissed without any fault being found; and, if so, whether, seeing that the rules of the workhouse prescribe that prayers should be read to Roman Catholics by a person of their own denomination, and that when Miss M'Kee was dismissed an undertaking was given to the Catholic guardians that the prayers would be read by a pauper inmate pending a fresh appointment, he will state whether the Local Government Board will take steps to have a Catholic female teacher appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Local Government Board did not refuse to sanction a pension to Miss M'Kee. The guardians proposed to abolish the offices of schoolmistress and assistant teacher, and to grant these officers superannuation allowances, it being understood that the workhouse children should be sent to extern schools. The Board pointed out that, in its opinion, the proposed arrangement was objectionable unless it were satisfactorily shown how the children were to be superintended before and after school hours. The guardians subsequently dispensed with the services of Miss M'Kee as assistant teacher and catechist. The Board had no power, however, to prevent them from doing this, and has no power to require them to appoint a successor.

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.

Leave to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 314.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 314.]

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Instruction standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for the Barnstaple Division of Devonshire to divide Clause 1 into three clauses is, I am authorised by Mr. Speaker to say, in his opinion, out of order on the ground that it is mandatory.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): Of course, Sir, I accept your ruling at once, but perhaps I may ask as a point of order when the important point raised by the Instruction can be brought before the House. I presume it would not be in order to bring it up on a Motion to postpone Clause 1, and I really cannot see what opportunity there can be if it is refused now. It involves a constitutional point of the greatest gravity, because if the Government are entitled to roll three clauses into one for the purpose——

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is not entitled to argue the Question or to make a speech.

MR. SOARES: Then, Sir, will you answer the Question I have put to you?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am afraid I can give no other Answer than that the Instruction is out of order because it is mandatory.

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Anglesey is not admissible. It is not open to him to move to postpone a sub-section; he can move to postpone a clause.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): I will amend my Amendment accordingly.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That means to postpone the whole Bill.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH then moved that the whole of Clause 1 be postponed. His reason for so doing was that three absolutely different matters which ought to have been dealt with in separate clauses were included in the clause. If they were included by mistake it was a serious error, but if they were included by intention it was a scandal. Were all these matters included in one clause in order that Clause 1, which was the whole Bill, might be obtained by one Motion of the closure? (Cheers.) If that were so, it was an abuse of drafting which he thought the Prime Minister, once his attention was called to it, with his sense of fairness would not countenance. He moved the Amendment in order to give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity even at the twelfth hour to make amends. The first section dealt with transfer of powers; the second with financial matters and the deduction under certain circumstances of money from Parliamentary grants; and third, did what had never been done before—it made the Act retrospective. The right hon. Gentleman in a moment of caution and frankness admitted——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The point the hon. Member is now raising is not relevant to his Motion. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman was not in order. Clause 1 could not be postponed because there was nothing to postpone it to, the clause being the whole Bill. The only other clause, Clause 2, deals with the title of the Bill.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: With great respect I am giving reasons for postponing the clause so that the Prime Minister may put things right.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Motion cannot be made. The only effect would be to put the Short Title first.

MR. SOARES: Are we to understand this important point cannot be debated at any time?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I can only find instances where it has been done by general consent.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire E.): The result of your ruling is that when a Bill contains only one clause there can be no Motion to postpone it.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is perfectly obvious. There is nothing to postpone the clause to. To make the Short Title first and the operative part second would be to invert the usual order of drafting a Bill.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked whether there was any remedy under the rules of the House. Was there not power in the Chair to protect the House against drastic action of this kind on the part of the Government?

*THE CHAIRMAN said that perhaps the object of the hon. Member for Anglesey could be attained by moving to omit Sub-section 1, and if the Amendment were successful the sub-section could be brought up as a new clause.

MR. WHITLEY: But is there no power in the Chair to protect the House against proceedings of this kind?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The draftsmanship of Bills is a matter which rests with the Government or hon. Member introducing them. The Chairman has no power to deal with that.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire N.) said it was clear that the clause dealt with three entirely different matters and he ventured to believe that had any private Member proposed to do such a thing, or to add to one clause two entirely different matters the Chairman would have refused permission. He submitted that it was in the power of the Chair—he would go further and say it was the duty of the Chair—to protect the House against this abuse of drafting. Cries of [" Order."] Yes and he made that statement with all respect for the Chair. He had not the least desire to be disrespectful, but he submitted that acting on the principle which had guided his decisions in the past the Chairman ought now to rule that Sub-sections 2 and 3 should be brought up in separate clauses.

*THE CHAIRMAN: As I have already stated the drafting of a Bill rests with the Government who brings it in. The hon. Gentleman wants me to split up Clause 1 into three separate clauses. There is no inherent power in the Chair to do anything of the sort.

MR. McKENNA: Then I ask leave to move that the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that Motion.

MR. McKENNA: Will you allow me to say one word on the point before you decide no tto accept the Motion. Assuming that you have not power to compel the Government to divide this clause into three clauses, may I submit that it is only on a Motion to report Progress that the Opposition can call attention to the abuse of drafting on the part of the Government. Surely that is a sufficient ground why you should accept the Motion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the Motion. I have already pointed out to the hon. Member for Anglesey that he can raise the question by moving to omit Sub-section 1 with the avowed object of bringing it up again as a new clause.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Could that Motion be put in such a way as not to interfere with the Amendment on the Paper?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot say anything as to that.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it surely was the duty of the Chairman to protect the minority in this respect. It was obvious that the object in thus drafting the Bill was so as to be able to closure it in one Motion. He quite accepted the ruling that it was not in the power of the Chair to divide the clause into three clauses, but he submitted that the Committee had the right, by a Motion to report Progress, to protest against this most scandalous abuse of the power of the Government.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) drew the attention of the Chairman to the marginal notes. These notes were required to be attached to a Bill by the orders of the House so that the Speaker or Chairman should have some guidance in ruling the proceedings of the House. Now this marginal note did not cover all the proposals of the clause, and surely it was open to the Chair to insist that the clause should be divided so that proper marginal notes could be inserted.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I can alter the marginal note, and if the hon. Member will suggest an alteration I will make it.

MR. MOSS inquired whether, if the Motion to omit the sub-section was defeated it would cut out all Amendments to the clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: We must follow the usual course. I will endeavour so far as I can to save the Amendments which hon. Members have put down on the Paper. There are one or two which would have to be sacrificed under any circumstances.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH moved to omit Sub-section 1, in order to give the Prime Minister an opportunity of justifying so gross a scandal as this. Three substantial matters were crowded into one clause with an object which was perfectly transparent. It was clearly done for the purpose of bringing the closure to bear on the clause as a whole. The Welsh Members were anxious to start the proceedings at any rate in a conciliatory spirit, and he appealed to the Prime Minister to meet them. If the right hon. Gentleman refused the opportunity, the responsibility would rest upon him.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Sub-section (1)."—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'The Board of Education' stand part of the clause."

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) desired to respond to the wish to discuss the Bill in a conciliatory spirit, but if he might be allowed to say so, the theory of drafting which the hon. Member advocated was absolutely novel. If one took up the statutes lying on the Table he would find twenty, forty, or eighty cases in which a larger variety of matter was dealt with in one clause, and in particular he instanced Clause 7 of the Education Act of last year and Clause 8 of the Local Government Act, 1894. In the latter case, the clause extended to one and a half pages, and the first sub-section alone dealt with such diverse matters as the power of parish councils to acquire land and buildings, to deal with recreation grounds, to utilise wells, springs, and streams, to deal with ponds, open ditches, and drains, to accept and to hold property, and many other subjects. In the drafting of the sub-section the Government had not departed by one iota from the traditions handed down to them, and the hon. Member on this occasion had evidently forgotton his great acquaintance with the statute law of the country.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) was far from saying they had not gone a long way in recent years in putting matters *diversi generis* into one clause, but if they looked at the statutes of twenty or thirty years ago it would be seen that this was not an immemorial practice. It was a dangerous practice, and one which had been abused in the present case. As to the clause in the Act of 1902, to which reference had been made, there were so many objections to be taken to details that it was not to be wondered at if this particular objection was not insisted upon. But, after all, the whole clause dealt with the powers of the managers, and the subjects were such as might very fairly be embodied in one clause. But the practice of putting diverse matters into one clause was a dangerous pratice; it circumscribed the liberties of the House, and ought, therefore, to be resisted.

MR. SOARES expressed his surprise that the Leader of the House should have adopted such a line upon this great constitutional question. Under the so-called Constitutional Party the liberties of this House were being gradually taken away. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] It was all very well for hon. Members opposite to laugh, but in course of time the position would change, and then they would strongly object if a measure for, say, the taxation of land values was compressed into one clause and forced through the House.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE contended that the argument of the Prime Minister was altogether inadequate, because Clause 7 of the Education Act dealt really with one matter, the powers of the managers. But the procedure here adopted was part and parcel of the whole method of the Prime Minister to dragoon the House of Commons and prevent discussion. He had decided that Wales was to be coerced. Very well; let him try it. It would take greater intelligence than that of the hon. Member for St. Pancras who cheered the idea. All the powers conferred by this Bill would not be sufficient for the purpose. But let the Government proceed; the people of Wales were prepared to meet them. Before it was done, however, the whole thing ought to be fairly discussed in the House of Commons. But the right hon. Gentleman did not think the House of Commons ought to discuss any of his decrees. This was deliberately done in order to prevent discussion. The Prime Minister relied on his authority and influence over the Chair to do it.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): I rise to order. Is the hon. Member in order in stating that any Member in this House relies on influence and authority over the Chair?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether the insinuation relates to me or the Prime Minister. If it relates to the Prime Minister, I think it is in order; if it is directed against me, I think it is not in order.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he would put himself in order by attributing it to the Prime Minister. There was, as he thought, no doubt about it. It was a matter of common talk in the whole House. Everything had been compressed into a single clause in order that the matter might be rushed through. But it was no use arguing with the Prime Minister; he knew perfectly well why it had been done. He warned the right hon. Gentleman that it was a very dangerous course to pursue. If, in the face of the strong feeling and the state of exasperation which had been aroused, the Prime Minister was going to give the House of Commons no fair opportunity of discussing any of the details of the Bill, he would rush the Government into a position which he would regret in the course of six months.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) thought the Committee would agree that it was much better drafting that these matters should be dealt with in one clause rather than it should be broken up. This was a clause which dealt essentially with one matter, and if hon. Members would look at the clause they would see that it conferred certain powers upon the Board of Education with regard to deductions from the Parliamentary grant. No doubt it would have been possible with some ingenuity to have manufactured several clauses, but undoubtedly it was much better drafting that it should be dealt with in one clause.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said the Attorney-General had made out that this was simply a question of draftsmanship. He wished to know if when the clause was drawn, instructions were given to draw it as shortly as possible and put everything in one clause. It appeared to be the object of the Government to apply the closure and have one division at a certain time in the afternoon when in their opinion the discussion ought to be closed. That was the object of putting all these three questions into one clause. These questions were totally distinct matters to those which had been quoted as precedents by the Prime Minister.

*SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said that he desired to say just one word about this matter. He would say nothing for the moment about the intention of drafting a Bill like this in one clause, but would rather call attention to the initial object of drafting a Bill in separate clauses. The reason of separate clauses being inserted was that they had in those clauses matters which were clearly distinguishable one from another and therefore must be dealt with separately. That ought to have been the case in the present Bill. But in the first sub-section of this one clause Bill powers were given to the Board of Education to manage education in Wales, and in the second sub-section they had given to them powers to deal with the recovery of the payments so made in respect of such management. The two sub-sections were entirely different, and ought, he submitted, to be dealt with in separate clauses.

MR. McKENNA said that with regard to what the Attorney-General had said he would like to call his attention to the actual wording of Sub-section 2. It was not anywhere stated in that clause what the Parliamentary grants referred to, and it must mean all the grants given for education.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY nodded assent.

MR. McKENNA: It is only the Parliamentary grants for education. The Attorney-General has just admitted our point. Continuing, he said that the local education authority was the county council and therefore this included all Parliamentary grants paid to the county council. [Cries of "No."] The Attorney-General would agree with him on the point that the county council being the local education authority, Parliamentary grants payable to the local education authority meant grants payable to the county council. But a wholly different body was brought in under Sub-clause 2. The sub-clause did not give any power to the Board of Education, after deducting the amount which they had paid for educational purposes, to pay the money over to the Crown, but as the sub-section stood it gave the Local Taxation Commissioners power to deduct the sum of money from the local taxation fund, and although it was not expressly stated, it was implied that that sum should be handed over to the Crown to pay debts incurred under this Bill. He submitted that the powers there given were not powers handed over to the Board of Education at all, but they were powers handed over to the Local Taxation Commissioners. That being so the Attorney-General could hardly deny that Sub-section 2 dealt with a totally different matter from Sub-section 1, and that it ought to be dealt with separately.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he did not think the Attorney-General had fully considered the effect of Sub-section 2. He admitted that Clause 1 of this Bill was intended to deal with the powers of the Board of Education, and that was in exact accordance with the marginal note. The right hon. Gentleman went on to argue that Sub-sections 2 and 3 were natural corollaries to the main proposition, and ought to be included, according to the rules of good draftsmanship, in Clause 1. He desired to call attention to the fact that under Sub-section 2 no powers were given to the Board of Education, but to some other body, and he did not know exactly what body. The first power given under Sub-section 2 was that—

> "Any sums paid by the Board of Education under this Act shall be a debt due to the Crown from the local education authority."

Who was going to sue for a debt due to the Crown? He would not give an offhand answer, but he apprehended that the Attorney-General would not advise the Board of Education to be the plaintiffs in any action against a local authority. Therefore this power was not given to the Board of Education but to some other authority. Then with regard to the deduction from any sums payable to that authority who was going to deduct that? The powers to deduct were given to some other body. Having regard to the logical evolution of this measure, and according to the principles of sound draftsmanship, the matters dealt with in these three sub-sections were distinctly different and ought to have been dealt with in separate clauses.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) reminded hon. Members that it might be necessary to apply a similar Bill to London next year. The first sub-section raised a great difficulty, because the education authority had got no money and no resources, and had no Parliamentary authority to make these payments. Where was the money to come from? These were all totally different matters, and ought to have been dealt with in entirely separate clauses. The Prime Minister had failed entirely in the precedents he had quoted. Their complaint was that the matters dealt with in this clause were three absolutely different subjects, and ought to be dealt with in entirely different clauses.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that in order to find out the meaning of the term "Parliamentary grant" it was necessary to refer to Section 24 of the 1902 Act, and to previous statutes. So far as he could gather the term "Parliamentary grant" meant a grant in aid of an elementary school, either annual or otherwise, out of moneys provided by Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS (Radnor) said that was not a Parliamentary grant within the meaning of Clause 7 of the Act of 1902.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he observed that the Attorney-General nodded assent to the exposition of the law given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University. But the hon. and learned Gentleman had not said so.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the sub-section was really absolutely clear

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) joined with the Welsh Members in protesting against the manner in which the Government were attempting to force the Bill through the House of Commons. He said that nothing could be clearer than the object of the Government in drafting the Bill and placing in the clause three distinctly divergent questions. It had no doubt been done to interfere with the liberties and convenience of the House. The attacks on their liberties had been made by various methods and lines. They had had blocking Notices, very late hours, all sorts of important subjects brought on at late hours, and closure by guillotine. This was the first time in this session they had had an attempt to curtail discussion, not by previous methods, but by an entirely new invention — through the method of drafting a Bill, and lumping together conflicting ideas in a particular clause in order to get a simultaneous closure on the whole clause. This was an entirely new departure on the part of the Prime Minister, and did great credit to his Parliamentary ingenuity, though whether it reflected equal credit upon his Parliamentary reputation was quite another question. Was either the Prime Minister or the Attorney-General prepared to say on his honour—[laughter] was the honour of either Gentleman to be laughed at?—[renewed laughter]—was either prepared to give a personal assurance that he had no idea in his mind when the clause was drafted, except the convenient and excellent methods of drafting, and that there was no sort of consideration that this was a convenient method of curtailing discussion?

Mr. MOSS said they had now in the Bill under discussion evidence of the disastrous effect of attempting to legislate in a panic. The Act of 1902 was forced through the House, and it was being interpreted differently from what was understood at the time.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now dealing with the Bill as a whole. He must confine himself to the particular Amendment before the Committee.

Mr. MOSS said he would bow to the ruling. The Attorney-General had said that the whole clause dealt with the powers of the Board of Education. That might be correct in regard to Sub-clause (*a*), but how the hon. and learned Gentleman could suggest that the other sub-clauses dealt with these powers passed his comprehension. These sub-clauses introduced entirely new legislation, and he certainly thought the Prime Minister should give Members of the House an opportunity for the discussion of the proposals. They did not wish to obstruct the measure, but they were entitled to demand that the various sub-sections should be threshed out on their merits. He moved that the clause be divided into three separate clauses.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 146; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 311.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Blundell, Colonel Henry.
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A.(Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortesque
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent,Favers'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Majendie, James A. H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Rt.Hn.Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Mr. Moss.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Donelan, Captain A.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt.EC(S.Andrw's Bghs
Evans,SirFrancis H (Maidstone
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt HnHerbert John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F(Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Hugh, Patrick A
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
O'Dowd, John
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shipman Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Soares.

Question put accordingly, "That the words 'Board of Education' stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 150; Noes, 68. (Division List No. 312.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt Hn Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour,RtHn.Gerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson(King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A(Glasgow
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V. C. W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir Horatio D.(Chatham
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson,Rt Hn Sir J(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F.Leverton (Tynem'th)
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Helder, Augustus
Hope,J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy,Vincent P (Cavan,W.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long,Rt Hn Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Majendie, James A. H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray,Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway,N.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tully, Jasper
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wills, Sir Frederick.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Crooks, William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E. C. (S Andrw'sBghs
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Soares.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said that he had an Amendment on the Paper to leave out "Board of Education" and insert "Treasury." He thought that under the circumstances he might be allowed to move it.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member was too late in asking to move his Amendment, but in any event the same point could be raised under Sub-section 1.

MR. J. H. LEWIS said that under these circumstances he would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. WHITLEY said he wished to move the Amendment standing in his name. This Bill was a Bill which did not affect Wales alone; they in Yorkshire were quite as much interested in it. If it went through unamended, it would enable the Board of Education to condemn local authorities without inquiry and without any process of law. Could anything be more un-English than that? Why, they would not treat the commonest beggar in that way. The entire matter was to be withdrawn from a Court of law and public inquiry and put into the hands of the Board of Education. The hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Board of Education was not, however, the kind of stuff of which dictators were made, yet he wanted to set aside the law of the land, and say that he, and he alone, should decide that a borough council or a county council was in default. He did not think the House of Commons would pass such a Bill without the most drastic amendment. Section 16 of the Act of 1902 provided that if a local authority failed to carry out its duties, the Board of Education might, after holding a public inquiry, make such Order as they thought fit. The Board had not tried the remedy provided by the Act of 1902; and yet they now proposed to abolish the right of inquiry and any process at law, and put what he would call Russian power into its hands. Speaking for Yorkshire, he said that they would not trust the Board of Education in this matter. If they did wrong, let them be brought before a Court of law, and let them have the rights of Englishmen, as provided by the Act of 1902. There might be a great many circumstances connected with a case which could only be brought out properly by a public inquiry. Under this Bill, a manager or a clergyman might creep round the corner to the Education Office in Whitehall, and say that he could not get this or that, and that he wanted the local authority punished. All they asked was that these people should come out into the open; they did not want any backstairs business going on in the Education Department, and they had sufficient confidence in their case to lay it before a public inquiry or a Court of law. He moved the Amendment, confident of the support of those who believed in the common right of the individual to justice.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, at beginning, to insert the words 'After holding a public inquiry at which all persons interested have been heard.'" —(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that the Amendment raised rather an important principle. As the Secretary to the Board of Education knew, he was not one of those who had taken a hostile view of the foundations of the Bill of 1902. He always looked upon it as capable of being built upon and improved; and as containing the germ of what might be made a very good system. The main principle was that education should be put in the hands of the local authorities, under, it was true, restrictions, the removal of which he had always looked forward to with confidence. This Bill, however, cut into the foundations of the Act of 1902. It provided that, if the Board of Education were not satisfied with what the local authorities were doing, they should be at liberty to take the matter into their own hands. That was quite inconsistent with the foundations of the Act of 1902; and was a confession of failure on the part of the Government. It might have been that there was friction which could have been avoided; but what he wished to insist upon was that they should not cut down the power of the local authority without the gravest reason; and, certainly, no such step should be taken without some kind of judicial inquiry, unless they intended to throw overboard altogether the main principle of the Act of 1902.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said that the right hon. Gentleman appeared to regard this Bill as a confession on the part of the Government of the failure of the Act of 1902. He did not agree with him. If the Committee bore in mind that the Act had been submitted to the closest criticism, that it had now been for many months in operation, and, if they considered the large area over which it extended, they would agree that, on the whole, the Act was working very smoothly and satisfactorily in the interests of education. He denied that the Act had been anything but a success. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Bill would cut down the power of the local authorities; they did not propose anything of the kind. They had been in constant communication with the local authorities, which was conducted on the most friendly terms; and it was to the interest of the Board, as well as to the interest of the local authorities, that such friendly relations should continue. His own belief and hope was that the Bill would affect comparatively few areas; and that it would be to the general interest that when it was brought into operation it should operate as speedily as possible. Teachers in certain areas were anxious to leave for their holidays, and their salaries had not been paid not merely up to date, but for the preceding quarter. In the winter the Board had complaints that schools were kept without fuel and without school-books. Was procedure by *mandamus*, the appropriate remedy for lapses of that sort on the part of the local authority; obviously they wanted something speedier, and something which would interfere as little as possible with the general action of the local authority.

Mr. HALDANE: If you have to choose between two evils, is it not the greater evil to alter the basis of your Act for the whole of England, where, on your own showing it is not necessary?

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON did not admit that they were altering the basis of the Act. They were anxious to maintain every power which the local education authority had. But in individual cases of pressing hardship the Board of Education ought to have the power to step in and administer a prompt and effectual remedy. Would they under a system of public inquiry have anything like that prompt remedy which common humanity demanded in such cases?

Mr. WHITLEY: Do you accept complaints without proof?

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Yes; provided they come from the clergy.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON challenged hon. Members to produce any case in which the Board of Education had acted without reference to the local authority on the complaint of a clergyman. The hon. Member for Carnarvon had pointed out in a speech delivered last year what endless opportunities for delay the requirement of a public inquiry offered. And yet these remedies were necessary to meet cases of pressing hardship. The Bill merely proposed that the Board of Education should have power to step in and do one particular thing in one particular school if by chance the local authority had left it undone. To proceed by *mandamus* would be a penal proceeding.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): The powers given to the Board are all penal powers.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said this remedy would not interfere with the action of the local authority over a great part of its area, and it would certainly not interfere a moment longer than that interference was necessary. The Board of Education did its utmost to be fair to both sides, and he repudiated with contempt the suggestion that it had ever departed from rigorous impartiality in the very wearisome and troublesome business of carrying the Education Act into operation.

Mr. BRYCE said the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education had taken the opportunity afforded by the Amendment for pronouncing a panegyric upon the Act of 1902, but he should like to ask him, as a student of English history and the English Constitution, whether any Act had been a greater failure than that which failed to carry with it the sentiment of the people. The severest condemnation to be passed upon a piece of legislation was that it excited the general disapproval of the people and that it created unprecedented difficulty in working. The hon. Gentleman said the Act had worked very smoothly and satisfactorily. Where had he been living since the Act was passed? He supposed, like the Prime Minister, he never read the newspapers.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON: The greater part of the time I have been at the Board of Education.

Mr. BRYCE said this was exactly his case. The Board of Education, he supposed, as was said of another place, had been up in a balloon. The Board of Education had never heard of passive resistance. It thought this Act had worked smoothly and satisfactorily, and did not take account of what was said in the country, and what happened in the Police Courts where cases of passive resistance were brought up.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON: Every complaint of anybody as to the working of the Act, and all newspapers containing complaints, come to the Board of Education, the latter regularly and the others when they arise.

Mr. BRYCE, continuing, said they knew from a very remarkable example that documents sometimes went to an office without being read. The reports of the Intelligence Department, for instance, went to the Secretary of State for War, but they were never read nor was any action taken upon them. He was not up in the latest statistics, and he did not know whether passive resisters were numbered by the 10,000 or by the 50,000, but at any rate they were numerous, and he was very much surprised, considering what had happened in regard to this movement and in regard to the resistance of local authorities, that the hon. Baronet should be able to say that the Act was working very smoothly and satisfactorily. He said they were not going by this Bill to cut down the powers of the local authorities, but what were those powers? This Bill gave power to the Board of Education by its own fiat to determine all questions of dispute at the expense of the local authority. There were a great many points in the Act of 1902 which were open to the greatest possible doubt, and the Board of Education was to come in in an autocratic manner and say that its view was the only right one. Were the local authorities not to be heard? Were they to be the only people to be debarred from going into Courts of law and asking whether their interpretation or that of the Government Department was the correct interpretation? The hon. Baronet said that it was in the interest of his office that its power should be applied considerately and in as small a number of cases as possible. But it would not rest with the Board entirely to say how it would exercise this power. Supposing the Board began to interfere with local authorities, was it not possible the local authorities might say, "We are not going to do this thing by halves; if the Board supersedes us at all they must supersede us altogether, we are not going to be parties to doing things imperfectly." It was possible that other authorities which hitherto had been trying to carry out the Act would sympathise with neighbouring authorities in what they considered to be the oppression that was practised upon them, and would refuse to do even what they were doing now. He was not at all sure that the Board would not be raising up for itself a far greater difficulty, and bringing a far larger number of local authorities into the field than they had any idea of.

The only argument that the Secretary of the Board had advanced in favour of this provision and against the Amendment, was that it would result in delay, but there was one thing more important than promptitude, and that was justice. They wanted some security and safeguard, which nothing less than the decision of a Court of law or public inquiry could give. The right hon. Gentleman wanted to be able to act promptly and at once; he wanted a naked sword, and did not want to wait to see what a Court of law thought. He was satisfied with his own judgment. He (Mr. Bryce) was satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman would endeavour to administer the Act fairly, but he was not the only person at the Board of Education. He did not know what the view of the permanent officials at the head of the Department might be, and all his confidence in the fairness and judgment of the right hon. Gentleman was not going to induce him to put the local authorities at the mercy of the Board. They must have some safeguard for the exercise of this power, and it could only be found either in requiring the Board to take the case before a Court of law to show and prove to the satisfaction of that Court that there had been default, or to make good its case by public inquiry, where all persons would have an opportunity of being heard. They would then be able to judge the Board of Education and to call the attention of the country to the circumstances under which the Board proceeded. He conceived, therefore, that the Amendment could be justified, and that the House would, by its rejection, create a new and very dangerous departure in all established principles of legislation.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he had been induced to rise not so much by the merits of the Amendment as by the arguments with which it had been resisted, and the amazing pretensions set up on behalf of the Board of Education. The hon. Baronet had spoken as though the holding of a public inquiry before the extraordinary and almost unparalleled powers conferred by this Bill were exercised was a procedure monstrous and unknown.

But it was most common for such inquiries to be held before action was taken by public Departments. A public inquiry was always held before any action was taken under the Fisheries Acts, and such inquiries often produced great results, and taught the Departments concerned something they did not before know. Managers and local authorities probably knew many things about education of which the hon. Baronet had not yet dreamed, and inquiries might prove of the greatest possible value not only as regarded the knowledge they would impart, but also as regarded the difference of temper they might import. He had been throughout a friend of the Act of 1902, but he recognised that there had been regrettable and surprising occurrences since the passage of that Act. One would hardly have believed that so many people would break the law for conscientious reasons, and he was strongly of opinion that sooner or later some compromise would have to be arrived at. At first sight he could not see why such animosity should be shown by the hon. Baronet to this harmless and ordinary Amendment. Everybody recognised the impartiality of the hon. Baronet, and no one would question his devotion to the public service or the cause of education. But while they recognised his personal qualities, his arguments against this Amendment were pitiable, and suggested most alarming views as to the functions of the Board of Education. The hon. Baronet said the Act had been completely successful.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I said that we always heard of the cases in which it was not successful, and that as they were so few and extended over so limited an area, we might regard the Act as having been, on the whole, successful.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked why, if that were so, this Bill was required? The Bill was to remedy the cases in which the Act of 1902 had not been successful, and those cases, according to the hon. Baronet, were few and insignificant.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Not insignificant.

Mr. Gibson Bowles.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES submitted that if the cases were few but significant they ought to be dealt with under the orginal Bill. Every private citizen who was aggrieved had to go to the Courts and submit to the law's delay. Why should the Board of Education be superior to all the incidents and proceedings of the Courts? The fact that the cases were significant made it the more necessary that they should be settled by the Courts. The assertion by the hon. Baronet that the local authorities had, or would, put obstacles in the way of the carrying out of the Act of 1902 was a serious condemnation of that measure. The local authorities were the basis of the Act, but they were now practically to be abolished and the Board of Education substituted. Notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. Baronet, the provision was penal in the respect the local authorities would most feel. The monies paid out by the Board of Education were to be debts due to the Crown, and, as such, were given a peculiarly sacred character. They could not be forgiven to the defaulting authority except by an Act of Parliament, preceeded by a money Committee of the whole House. The Bill gave to the Board an absolute and overriding power. Year by year the ambition of Departments had been growing until it had now reached the most inordinate dimensions. They had grasped after more work, because work had meant power, and power importance. He would not object so much if the power was in the hands of the hon. Baronet, but the authority of the Department was usually exercised by a second or third-class clerk. He begged the hon. Baronet not to follow the course pursued with the latter part of the Act of 1902, and closure the whole thing, not to make himself the mere mouthpiece of the Department or to lend himself to its aggrandisement; but to accept as far as he could any reasonable Amendments that might be proposed.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) thought the genesis of this Bill was that some ingenious person in the Board of Education, desirous of getting round a very real difficulty, had tried to devise a method of, so to speak, painless dentistry by which the Act might be remedied with the least possible trouble. He believed, however, that the whole scheme would be too clever by half. He could not see what possible effect the Bill would have upon the real difficulty presented by the problem in Wales and elsewhere. The local authorities would probably be able to carry out their wishes in spite of the Bill. The fact of the matter was that the Government in 1902 committed a gross political blunder in asking local authorities to carry out an Act which was fundamentally in some respects antipathetic to their views. When such a course was adopted, trouble was bound to arise. With regard to the Amendment, he thought if the hon. Baronet gave way on this point he would do much to help the working of his Bill. Personally he did not want the Bill; he did not think it was the proper way to deal with the matter at issue; but from the hon. Baronet's point of view the Bill would act infinitely better if he gave way to this demand for a public inquiry. In the long run he would probably find that the other local authorities would fall into line with Wales rather than Wales with the other local authorities. If a public inquiry were allowed, any real grievance would be discussed, and the opinion of the locality thereby affected; but if the inquiries were merely conducted by the Board without any publicity the local authorities would have no confidence in them, and would be hostile to the conclusions, whatever they were. Thus matters would go from bad to worse, and therefore, because he thought something might be done by this Amendment to soften the effect upon the local authorities, he should support his hon. friend.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Baronet had overlooked the fact that under the Act of 1902, with regard to a *mandamus*, the first step was an inquiry, so that the Government by their present proposal were simply worsening the original Act. He fully admitted that an inquiry would take time. Personally, he would use every possible weapon to frustrate both the Act of 1902 and the present Bill, and the hon. Baronet had better not be too sure that he was not making matters worse. Upon that point they would probably have another talk about six months hence. The hon. Baronet was very likely doing a great disservice to the schools he wished to protect by insisting on these arbitrary powers being put into operation without even a preliminary inquiry. The Welsh county councils refused to be parties to oppressing their fellow religionists and forcing them by means of legal procedure to teach doctrines to which they conscientiously objected, or to allow the expenditure of public money on education without public control. If the Board of Education insisted on administering a part of the Act themselves the county councils would say, "You must also administer the rest of it." As to the question whether fuel was provided or not for the schools, that could easily be inquired into; and as to whether a school was understaffed or not, the local education authorities might say it was as good as it was before the Act came into operation. When the burden was upon the parson, wonderful was the indulgence of the Board of Education; but the moment the burden was cast upon the ratepayer, their zeal was marvellous to behold. The local education authorities might say, "Before we do anything, let us see what the other schools are doing, and therefore let us have an inquiry into the whole of the circumstances of the county;" but without any inquiry the Board of Education would proceed to act probably upon letters they had received, not altogether from parsons, but from Bishops. He was not saying that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education was doing anything that was deliberately unfair. No doubt he had a great sense of justice, but he was taking his case from the parsons instead of acting according to his own mind. This Act was, in fact, the result of Episcopal pressure.

Of course, the object of the Government was to get the Bill through without amendment in order to save a Report stage. It was not a question with them of the best methods of draftsmanship or of improving the Bill. They had always their eyes upon the political situation; they were always looking at the clock and at the thermometer. But all these things were irrelevant to an Act of Parliament. When once the Bill was passed, he was quite sure that the thermometer would be in a much worse condition. The method of the Government was arbitrary and unknown in English law. It was borrowed from Siam—it was Oriental and ought not to be introduced into a free community like this. He had brought forward cases which the Parliamentary Secretary had never heard of. Inquiry followed and was conducted in a very judicial manner. Then it was found that the facts were very much understated. Suppose there had been no inquiry the Parliamentary Secretary would have been guilty of a gross act of injustice quite unconsciously. The moment the Parliamentary Secretary went into the facts he would see there was an equity behind. Were the brewers to be the only people to have an equity in that Parliament? There was only equity for brewers but not for Nonconformists. The Government had got into all these troubles from lack of thought. They must not be led away by the parsons and certainly not by the Bishops. They had muddled everything they had taken up. All the prophecies uttered about what would happen when the Education Bill was passed had come true. The Government by the present Bill virtually admitted that, but what could they say of a Government that could neither rule nor resign? Welsh Members had done their best to keep peace in Wales. If they had not done so there would be worse trouble over the Education Act than there was now. If the present Bill passed the responsibility would be off the hands of the Welsh Members. The Government did not quite realise what they were doing and therefore he urged them to make inquiry.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the hon. Gentleman had stated that the difficulties which existed now were nothing to the difficulties which would arise when the present Bill came into operation. If the hon. Gentleman took that view of the effect of the Act, he would have expected him to help it to become law as speedily as possible.

Mr. EMMOTT: Did you do that with Home Rule?

Mr. Lloyd-George.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that he thought the remark he had made was a fair comment to make upon the observations of the hon. Member for Carnarvon. He had found fault with the statement that some of the county councils had taken a course which had borne very hardly upon children and teachers. In Montgomeryshire there were fifteen schools in which the teachers had not received any salary since the beginning of April. The Parliamentary Secretary had stated that there were schools in which it had not been possible to provide fuel or books and apparatus. The prosecution of the war against the Act clearly compelled the county councils to be indifferent to the sufferings entailed on teachers and children. The Board of Education would take no step under this Act without the most careful inquiry. What the Opposition wanted was a public inquiry which would involve endless delays. Would any one tell him that one did not often get at the truth most thoroughly by sifting statements made and making inquiries in private? [An Hon. Member: A Star Chamber.] The hon. Member for King's Lynn had insisted that the second sub-section was a penal section. Surely it was not penal to ask that a man should pay the money that was due from him. The hon. Member for Carnarvon said this clause was unexampled and must have been borrowed from Siam. It was not, however, necessary to seek an example further away than the Education Act of 1870, under the 66th Section of which the Department had the power, if they were of opinion that there had been default on the part of a school board, to suspend all the members. There was no provision for inquiry. And yet the hon. Member for Carnarvon told the House that they had to go to Siam for a parallel case. As a matter of fact all they needed to do was to go to the Act of Parliament passed by a Liberal Government in 1870.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was simply a provision for suspension. It was without precedent to find that a debt was due from an individual or local authority without first examining the evidence.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY contended that if there was a difference it was that the procedure under Section 66 was much more penal than in the other case, because they could order that the members should vacate their seats.

MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) asked if the Attorney-General could give them an instance where a board was suspended without an inquiry.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that what he was pointing out was that, in addition, Section 63 empowered the Education Department to supersede the school board and appoint another board, and these drastic powers were to be exercised after such inquiry as the Department thought sufficient. The whole thing was left to the discretion of the Education Department, and it was well known that they would not proceed to exercise these powers without adequate inquiry. He thought a considerable number of instances of this kind could be found. The question, however, before them was not in how many cases this power had been exercised, but whether it was necessary to go to Siam to find a precedent. The hon. Member for Carnarvon demanded a public inquiry, but no doubt he would recollect that the ultimate resort in case of a *mandamus* was that the members of the council who refused would have to go to prison.

MR. WHITLEY: Yes, after a trial.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that here there was no question of going to gaol at all. [AN HON MEMBER: Nor of a trial.] The only proposal in the Bill was that these expenses which ought to have been borne by the county council should be defrayed, with power of recovery, and in case of default should be made good. Was it even tolerable to contemplate that they should have a separate public inquiry every time a teacher's salary got into arrears, or when coals or school books were required. He asked the Committee to look at this matter not so much in the interests of the teachers or education generally but in the interests of the children.

*__MR. WILLIAM JONES__ said he wondered whether the Attorney-General would dare to make a speech like that in Scotland. Wales had done more for education comparatively than either Scotland or England. He could not understand the Attorney-General saying that this provision was necessary in the interests of the children, as if the Welsh nation could be charged with any disposition to neglect the education of its children. What they wanted was simply a moderate form of public inquiry. How could they expect cases to be fairly dealt with unless there had been a fair inquiry. He would mention one out of two or three that might be cited. Under Section II of the Education Act of 1902 the Board of Education in December last issued a series of Draft Final Orders providing for the appointment of four "foundation managers" for each non-provided school in Wales. The County Council of Carnarvonshire thereupon served formal notices of objection, and departmental inquiries were held by a most competent commissioner on behalf of the Board of Education. There were some astounding results. In one case the Board of Education had been informed that religious instruction distinctive of the Church of England had been given for thirty years past. It transpired that nothing but simple biblical teaching had been given. There was also an instance in which the functions of the Acting Managers had been usurped on the appointed day by the clergyman. This gentleman, in conjunction with other churchmen, had appointed interim foundation managers—a privilege belonging really to the Acting Managers, who, in this case happened to be, with one single exception, noncomformists. What happened? Why, the Board of Education cancelled the Draft Final Order in each of these instances. Surely what was wanted was a system of full and impartial investigation throughout Wales, otherwise how could the people be expected to have confidence in the action of the Department? The Welsh people who had sacrificed so much for their educational system were determined to direct and conduct that system in accordance with their national genius and conviction.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) said this discussion seemed a most extraordinary one.

The House could not find time to pass an Education Bill for Scotland which was approved by every Scotch Member on either side, but it was asked to pass a so-called Education Bill for Wales to which almost every Welsh Member was opposed. This proposal to override the judgment of the county councils without inquiry was one of the worst attacks on local government they had yet seen. How could the Board of Education be satisfied that a county council was in default unless there was a public inquiry? The Government admitted that there must be some inquiry, but the inquiry they favoured was a backstairs inquiry in which the Department was informed through gossip and letters from persons whose names were not disclosed. The Attorney-General in his calmer moments would be the last to suggest that that was a method by which the truth could really be arrived at. The hon. and learned Gentleman had stated that there was a precedent for what was now proposed in the action of the House in the past in connection with the Education Act of 1870, and he referred to two clauses of that Act. He did not think that hon. Members from Wales would much object to what these clauses laid down. What was prescribed was not that the Education Department should act on its own initiative after a school board had been dissolved, but that it should have the power in certain circumstances to declare that a school board was dissolved, and that in its stead a new school board should be elected. What was the true construction of that? The section went on to state that the position was to be the same as if a member had died. What was the position of a member of a school board who died. (Laughter). He had no desire in discussing this Education Bill to enter into the merits of theology at all. What became of the seat of a member of a school board when it was vacated by death? He ventured to say that the invariable practice was that where a school board was in default it was not by appointment from the Education Department that the vacancy was in fact filled up.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the 63rd section of the Act of 1870 prescribed the procedure in such cases,

Mr. Wallace.

Mr. WALLACE did not admit that the Attorney General's view was the right one; but assuming that it was, what was the action of the Education Department in dealing with them? It was dealing with school boards elected specifically to deal with the education question only. What was proposed by this Bill was not to deal with small obscure school boards in different parts of the country, but to deal with the regularly elected county councils in Wales, overriding their judgment and insisting on their carrying out whatever the Education Department prescribed. What they were asking for in this connection was that a complaint should be verified by a public inquiry and that an opportunity should be given for hearing evidence on the other side. They did not ask that in the event of default the penalties should not be imposed. He could not understand the position the Government had taken up. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that local inquiry would lead to great delay. Would the private inquiry take less time than a public one? Would it take less time to send an inspector down to hear evidence at one place than to have day by day letters dribbling into the Education Department from different persons in the county? If it was a question of delay the proposal of the Government was the worst that could possibly be made.

Sir JOHN GORST said that what was asked was not that the county councils should have an opportunity of putting their case before the Board of Education, but that the Board in every case should be under an obligation to send an official down to the spot to hold a local public inquiry. He could assure the Committee that in the past there never had been any idea on the part of the Education Department of avoiding the most careful inquiry into the facts and the most careful attempt to induce the local authority to perform their duty before any interference took place. He did not think a single school board had been declared in default until the whole circumstances were most accurately known at headquarters. In the present case there was no dispute about the facts; the local authorities simply declined to administer the law. There was, therefore, no need for a local public inquiry. He was not a defender of the arbitrary power of bureaux in

London. But in a case of this kind he did not believe the House would incur the slightest danger in entrusting these powers to the Board of Education, who would certainly never use them in any case where there was the slightest doubt about the facts.

MR. PHILIPS (Pembrokeshire) strongly supported the claim for a local inquiry. In such a question as education they got in the country districts strong sectarian prejudices, and excellent men with the best intentions thought they were absolutely right, while the other side thought they were absolutely wrong and it was impossible to get a reliable fact or figure, people took such opposite views. The point was vividly illustrated some time ago in a controversy on the disestablishment question, in which the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs took one side and the Bishop of St. Asaph was on the other. Someone summed up the controversy by saying that the Bishop of St. Asaph was the biggest liar in Wales, but that the hon. Member for Carnarvon was more than his match. The hon. Member was wondering even yet whether it was intended as a compliment. Of all the questions which demanded a public inquiry, this question demanded it most. This Bill, after all, was a financial Bill. It was a Bill which was going to lead to the expenditure of large sums of money. It was a commonplace that one of the great abuses of the day was the reckless expenditure of local authorities. What encouragement would this Bill give the local authorities conconcerned to be accurate in their accounts? They might make estimates, but if the grants were stopped how could they reckon what they would have to spend? If a county council had an inquiry and knew that they were going to have some of their money stopped, they would know what rate they had to levy. But if it was done in a hole-and-corner way by some person writing to London, then it was obvious that the county council finance was going to be upset. If their money was going to be taken away and they had to have heavier rates in consequence, they should have a chance of representing their point of view at a local inquiry.

Several Members rose to continue the discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 153; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 313.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHn. Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. HonA.J.(Manch'r
BalfourRtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt.Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon Sir John C.R.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, RtHon. SirWilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fergusson RtHn.SirJ.(Manch'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
HamiltonMarq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard John(KentFaversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland.
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Hereage
Leveson-Gower Frederick N S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P (Galway, N.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J G (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Crooks, William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Devlin, Charles R. (Galway)
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Fuller, J. M. F.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V (Rossendale)
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Dowd, John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, John Wynford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L (Cleveland)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 82; Noes, 166. (Division List No. 314.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James

Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andr'w's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V (Rossendale)
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanhope, Hon. Philip James
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whitley and Mr. Wallace.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chathm)
Devlin, Charles Ramsay Galw'y
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T (Denbigh)
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Majendie, James A. H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Dowd, John
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.

Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H(Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G(Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Whereupon Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the clause to the word "make," inclusive, in line 10, stand part of the clause' be now put.'"

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the clause to the word "make," inclusive, in line 10 stand part of the clause' be now put.'"

The CHAIRMAN named the Tellers.

Tellers for the Ayes, Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes. Tellers for the Noes, Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

The Division bells were rung, and the Members sitting on the Ministerial Benches left their seats, entered the Division Lobby, ready to record their votes. A number of Members gathered behind the Bar and at the doors leading into the Division Lobbies, evidently in anticipation of a demonstration by the fifty or sixty hon. Members on the Opposition Benches above and below the Gangway, who persistently kept their seats. There was an almost dead silence for some minutes, when,

THE CHAIRMAN invited hon. Members to leave the House and enter the Division Lobbies.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, seated, and with his hat on, said: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I ask you whether under the Standing Orders a wholesale closure of this character can be applied as long as there is a substantial Amendment on the Paper to be discussed. I call your attention to one Amendment amongst others. This is the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Dewsbury—

> "To insert after 'satisfied' in line 6 of page 1, 'that all the requirements of the local authority in regard to ventilation, lighting, sanitary arrangements and cubical space have been complied with, and.'"

I ask if that is not a substantial Amendment which ought to be discussed in the interests of the children about whose care we have heard so much? Are we only to be allowed to discuss questions connected with catechisms, and not points as to the provision of decent air for the children? I say that under the Standing Order the closure ought not to be applied when an Amendment of that character is on the Paper. It is a disgraceful thing that the closure should be applied in this way. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Order," and OPPOSITION cheers.]

*THE CHAIRMAN: In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that the Standing Order does not say anything with regard to that. But it says—

> "When a clause is under consideration, Motion may be made (the assent of the Chair as aforesaid not having being withheld) that the Question that certain words of the clause defined in the Motion stand part of the clause, or that the clause stand part of, or be added to, the Bill, be now put."

With regard to the substance of the Amendment to which the hon. Member has called my attention, I am not now in a position to say whether it is a substantial Amendment or not; but it seems to me that the matters referred to are governed by the general law.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: On that point it is a question whether the law has been carried out. I submit that if the law be enforced against the county councils to compel them to pay rates, why should not the law be enforced against persons in order to secure pure air for the children?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I should say most certainly.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Then why should one side be discussed, and not the other?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is for the Board of Education to see that the law is being properly carried out. [OPPOSITION cries of "They do not."]

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: But they do not.

*THE CHAIRMAN: You must not blame me for it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am blaming you for not giving us an opportunity of discussing a question of this sort.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is a question of general law.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: May I ask whether we are to understand from your ruling that the substantiality of the Amendments did not affect your judgment in accepting the closure, and whether it is not the case that you are aware that your ruling accepting the closure rules out four-fifths of the Amendments on the Order Paper?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have to regard the substantiality of the Amendments in deciding whether I would accept the closure or not, and also other circumstances.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: What circumstances? The exigencies of the Government! [MINISTERIAL cries of "Obstruction."] The exigencies of the Cecil family! [MINISTERIAL cries of "Order, order!"]

MR. WHITLEY: Are you aware, Mr. Chairman, that we have only discussed one Amendment out of four pages on the Paper? [MINISTERIAL cries of "Too much."]

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not quite correct. We have only discussed two Amendments in four hours. The Question is "That the Question that the words of Clause 1 after 'Board of Education' down to 'make' stand part of the clause, be now put."

HON. MEMBERS on the MINISTERIAL Benches proceeded to the division lobby. The Welsh Members and other Members on the Opposition Benches above and below the Gangway, however, retained their seats. After an interval.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask hon. Members to be good enough to proceed to the division lobbies.

MR. WHITLEY: What After this!

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I do not see any object in taking part in a farce of this kind—absolutely none. It is a perfect farce that we should not be allowed to discuss a question of light and air for the children. I think it is monstrous.

MR. WHITLEY: These are the local authorities who are to be entrusted with the education of the children!

MR. GUEST (Plymouth.): What are the general principles, you, Mr. Chairman, have given for the application of the closure in this case?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I will not enter into any argument with the hon. Member. I ask hon. Members to be kind enough to follow the usual course, and to proceed to the division lobbies. If they decline to do that, I must take other steps. Hon. Members have made their protest.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda): You have shut out the most important Amendments on the Paper, Mr. Chairman, why not put the whole Bill?

MR. EMMOTT: I consider it grossly unfair that we are not allowed to discuss these questions.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: You have, I think, shut out the most important Amendment on the Paper, which stands in my name, by your ruling.

MR. McKENNA: If you accept the closure on the Motion of the Prime Minister there is nothing more to be said; but if you tell us that you have exercised an independent discretion, that you have decided in going through the Amendments, not to exclude the Amendments, which ought to be discussed, by accepting this closure Motion—if you tell us that on your authority, it will be a different matter.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have exercised the best discretion I possess. It is extremely difficult, as the hon. Member will see, to make up one's mind with regard to every Amendment which appears on the Paper as to the different degrees of substantiality. I can assure hon. Members that I have exercised the best of my discretion in accepting the Motion, and I consider that in accepting that Motion I have not excluded any Amendments which were really of a substantial character. I would ask hon. Members who have now made their protest, and made it, if I may say so, in a dignified way, whether they will not allow the usual course to be followed and take a division in the ordinary way.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am not going to divide. I am bound to make a protest.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES: We are most unwilling to disobey your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but in the interests of education in Wales we think these Amendments ought to be discussed, and not be sacrificed in the interests of a week-end holiday.

Mr. William Abraham.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I can assure hon. Members that I quite recognise the feelings which actuate them. I can assure them of that; but I am placed in a very difficult situation. It is my duty, as far as possible, to safeguard the rights of the minority.

MR. EMMOTT: May I respectfully ask you, Mr. Chairman if you think it is a proper and reasonable thing that a Bill like this should be rushed through at a Friday sitting?

MR. WHITLEY: May I ask whether that would have been done if it had not been at the end of the session?

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): Why should not the same course of procedure be taken with the remaining stages of any English Bill?

MR. GUEST: Why should we have any discussion at all?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The rules of the House are well known to hon. Members, and I am afraid that this is not the first occasion on which a Bill has been dealt with in this way. I can only hope that, under the circumstances, those hon. Members who protest will follow the usual course.

MR. MOSS: Do you think it fair, Mr. Chairman, to block out 50 per cent. of the Amendments at this time of the afternoon?

MR. BRIGHT (Shropshire, Oswestry): This is in the interest of liberty, and a protest should be made. I beg of you, Mr. Chairman, to re-consider your decision.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I repeat my request to hon. Members that they now consent to go into the lobby. Otherwise I shall have to take such steps as are provided for under the Standing Orders.

MR. GUEST: Will you give us any undertaking that we shall be allowed to discuss the further stages of the Bill at reasonable length?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must see that it is impossible for me to enter into bargains of that kind. I have said that I will do my best to secure such discussion as is reasonable.

MR. GUEST: We have discussed only two Amendments out of four pages.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that hon. Members decline to proceed to the division lobbies?

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): I refuse distinctly; I have had no opportunity of discussing the Bill.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I direct your attention to Standing Order 162a, which provides that in case of grave disorder arising in the House the Speaker may adjourn the House without Question put. I submit that a deadlock has arisen leading to the possibility of grave disorder, and that the power under the Standing Order should be put into operation.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That rests with the discretion of the Chairman entirely. I am compelled to name certain hon. Members for disregarding the authority of the Chair. I name Mr. Guest, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Harwood, Mr. Alfred Davies, and Mr. Lloyd-George. I shall have to report these hon. Members and others to the House for having disregarded the authority of the Chair.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Why pick and choose? You did that once before.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): Will you tell the reason why we refused to obey your order?

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Are you going to ask the House to suspend from the service of the House all the Members who are taking part in the discussion of this Bill, and so practically disfranchise Wales?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members must conform to the rules of the House.

The House resumed.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, through illness, I have to take the Chair as Deputy-Speaker. I have to report to the House that during the division that was recently called in Committee a number of hon. Members refused to leave the House when called upon by me, as Chairman of Committees, to do so. The names of the hon. Members who refused to leave when I called upon them to do so are as follows:—Mr. Guest, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Harwood, Mr. Alfred Davies, Mr. Lloyd-George, Sir Alfred Thomas, Mr. Moss, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Dr. Shipman, Mr. Levy, Mr. H. J. Wilson, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. George White, Mr. Philips, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. William Jones, and Mr. Herbert Roberts. As regards those Members whom I have just mentioned I have now again to ask them to leave the House.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: We are exceedingly sorry to disobey the rulings of the Chair. But we are doing it from a keen sense of public obligation. Does any hon. Member really suppose that we would do this unless we were compelled? I am sure there is not a single man who does not do this with deep regret. But this has gone too far. We must make a most emphatic protest against the action which you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, have taken at the instigation of the Prime Minister. We consider that you ruled out questions of vital importance to our constituents, and we cannot, consistently with our sense of duty, take any further part in this farce of a Parliamentary session.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES: There is not a man in this House who would less wish to show any discourtesy to the

Chair or to the House than I would. But I am interested in the education of my country. I have consistently supported the main lines of the policy of the Education Act; and it is only because this Bill is directed to coercing Wales and because it will practically paralyse education and cause a deadlock in our great work that I am taking this course.

MR WILLIAM ABRAHAM: I have been in this House nearly twenty years, and this is the first time in my history as a Member of Parliament that I have felt compelled by the exigencies of the case to defy the Chair in the interests of education. Sorry as I am, in the interests of education—[HON. MEMBERS laughed]—if hon. Members had come here without having been educated they would not laugh. If they had known what it was to start work in a colliery at ten years of age without education they would not laugh. I am now becoming one of the oldest Members of the House, but I will protest even though I have to be carried out.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members have always treated me with the greatest courtesy, and I feel that they are deeply moved in the action which they are taking. They have made a protest, and I have said that it is a dignified protest and worthy of them in the difficult circumstances in which they are placed. But I appeal to them not to compel me to have recourse to the enforcement of the rule. I therefore submit to hon. Members that I should resume my place at the Table as Chairman of Committees; that the Question should be again put; and that a division should take place in the ordinary way. I only wish to make a suggestion. If hon Members will not take that course then I shall be compelled to ask them to leave the House for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

MR. GUEST: Do I understand that we are to leave the House for a division or as being suspended from the service of the House, because I may say that I desire to make this protest against your decision in the interests of Parliamentary discussion. I do not desire to offer any personal violence, but I wish to make my protest against the decision you have given as Chairman of Committees, for in my view that decision was entirely subversive of Parliamentary discussion. But, having made that protest, if you suspend me I am prepared to leave the House at your bidding.

MR. EMMOTT: The situation may be relieved if the Prime Minister will give an undertaking that he is not going to push this Bill through the House to-day. Personally I have not felt able to go as far as my hon. friends and to refuse to leave the House; but we do think that this thing ought not to have been done.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I feel that we cannot take any further part in a discussion of this character. I and my hon. friends do not want to appear to defy the rulings of the Chair; but we shall absolutely refuse to take any further part in the proceedings. We shall walk out and wash our hands of the whole business.

*MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I do not know that we are strictly in order; but I am quite certain that we all feel that it would be desirable to avoid any of the unseemly scenes which we have witnessed in the past. Therefore, I am glad to hear what my hon. friend said. I entirely sympathise with him and those who are associated with him in the protest he has made, and if my hon. friend takes the course he has suggested, we on these Benches shall leave the House also and take no further part in the discussion.

And then the House again resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Question, "That the Question 'That the words of the clause to the word "make," inclusive, in line 10, stand part of the clause' be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the words of the clause to the word 'make,' inclusive, in line 10, stand part of the clause," put, and agreed to.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

SHOP HOURS BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): I wish to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House. I venture to think that after what has taken place it would be quite impossible to go on taking other business this afternoon. It is true that the measure now called on is one over which no very controversial feelings are entertained, but the scene we have just witnessed is one which renders it quite impossible for the House of Commons to proceed with the discussion. I would ask the Prime Minister whether he himself really desires that we should go on. Surely after a scene like this the right hon. Gentleman does not want to snatch the paltry advantage of getting a few Bills smuggled through. I am sure that it would not be a dignified thing for the right hon. Gentleman to do, and therefore I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am afraid the Motion of the hon. Member is not in order, because it is not according to the Standing Order as there is no Motion now before the House. If the hon. Member will allow an Amendment to be moved, it will then be open to move the adjournment of the debate.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I move the new clause standing in my name.

A clause (Exemption of Shopkeeper.) —(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*) Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: I will not repeat my arguments; but will simply move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Winston Churchill.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not quite follow the reasoning of the hon. Gentleman. The Shop Hours Bill is one which, I think, is generally desired by the House, and if it has critics at all those are to be found on this side of the House rather than on the other. In these circumstances I should have said that this occasion, however unfortunate in its inception—everyone knows what my views on that will naturally be—is an occasion or proceeding with the Bill.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I should be very sorry myself if the Shop Hours Bill did not pass into law, and, although it does not go so far as some of us wish, it is no doubt a valuable measure. But of course we are placed in very unusual and unexpected circumstances, and I think, if the right hon. Gentleman assures us that when this Bill has been disposed of no other business will be taken, we might come to a conclusion.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): An undertaking was given that this Bill should not be taken to-day. I am very anxious that the Bill should pass, but a relative of mine, a member of the House, as representing the Jewish community, had an Amendment which he was very anxious to move, and which he would be prevented from moving if the Bill were taken now. He understood from the Patronage Secretary that the Bill would not in any circumstances be taken to-day.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I think we may be able to secure our object by giving the Government an effective promise, so far as the Opposition is concerned, that when the Bill is taken again we will facilitate its passage into law. But, as far as the present situation is concerned, it would be utterly beyond all precedent to ask the House to proceed with any business, however important. The House is not in any condition to do so now. If hon. Members opposite would try to put themselves into the position of the Opposition they would find that the most reasonable thing was to accept the Motion.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I hope that the Government will accede to this Motion. We on this side have received repeated appeals from the Chair to take a certain course, and we have done our best, at any rate, to maintain the traditions of the House. I think that some hon. Gentlemen opposite, at all events, will accept my view in that respect. In the circumstances I would appeal to the Prime Minister to treat us in a manner more befitting the office he holds in the exceptional position which we occupy this afternoon. The debate on the Bill which we have just been discussing would in ordinary circumstances have undoubtedly lasted for the whole of the rest of the evening, and in these circumstances the Prime Minister might, I think, meet us by adjourning now.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): How has the position in which we are placed arisen? It has arisen solely and entirely because a certain number of Members, after full warning, chose deliberately to set at defiance the ruling of the Chair. If they are placed in a position of difficulty in consequence, they have no one but themselves to blame.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.): Is the right hon. Gentleman in order in referring to a debate which has been closed?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman is out of order for doing so, for the reason that the adjournment has been moved by reason of those circumstances. At the same time I am sure he will exercise great discretion in the way he treats the matter.

MR. CHAPLIN: I hope that I have not in any way exceeded expressions which are courteous. If I have exceeded the limits of discretion I am quite willing to withdraw; but as an old Member of the House it is my opinion that to accede to a request of this kind would be to offer nothing but a premium on disorder.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington): I saw late last night a prominent Member of the Opposition, who asked me not to take this Bill to-day. I promised him that the Bill should not be taken. I think that the debate might now be adjourned, and that the House might go on with the next business.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he agreed with a great deal of what the right hon. Gentleman opposite had said, and if the right hon. Gentleman wished to discuss this Bill he was quite willing to stay as long as the right hon. Gentleman pleased. The only thing he would say with regard to the right hon. Gentleman himself was that he was not at all sure that he had not procured an early pair, and that when he had made his protest he would not go off comfortably to his dinner and leave the House to discuss the measure without him. It was easy under those circumstances to come down and deliver Phillippics against the debate being adjourned. He did not think the suggestion made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury ought to be accepted. If this Bill were put down first on the Paper it ought to be taken first. If they were going to take this Bill, and the discussion upon it was to be adjourned, then he thought they should take no other business. They came down to the House prepared to discuss certain questions. They went through the Paper, and the Bills that stood first on the Paper were the Bills the House was ready to discuss. It was not for the Government to press the House for this and the other Bills, and offer to the House for discussion a measure which in ordinary course would not be taken. He, for one, was quite ready to discuss any measure, but he did not think it was right to ask the House to pass to this other business. If the Government insisted upon going on with the business, they ought to go on with this Bill, but having regard to what had taken place, and the feeling of irritation roused by the Prime Minister, he did not think it was desirable for the House to continue sitting.

MR. GUEST (Plymouth) asked whether, in the event of this debate being adjourned, it was possible to go on with other business. They were now discussing the adjournment of the debate on the Shop Hours Bill, and in the event of the debate being adjourned he submitted other business could not be proceeded with.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the only possible course, if the House adjourned this debate, would be to proceed with the other orders.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that, as one to whom the rights of the House were very dear and to whom the rights of every Member were equally dear, he might perhaps be allowed to say a few words. In the first place he regretted to see that a large number of Members of the House had left. They had taken the weakest course. When one had one horse killed under him he should at once get another and continue the fight.

AN HON. MEMBER: We did not ask your opinion.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Possibly not, but I venture to give it. The hon. Member, continuing, said: The question before the House was the adjournment of the debate, and the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury had admitted that what had been alleged on the opposite side of the House was well founded and he stated that he had agreed not to take this particular Bill on this particular occasion. He had agreed with the other side to adjourn this debate. As the Chairman had ruled, that would not preclude the continuance of the debate on all other Government business until it was concluded. After this Question had been disposed of, and the debate adjourned on this particular Bill, all the rest of the Government business had to be taken, and when that was concluded Mr. Speaker would leave the Chair. But under the circumstances he would suggest to his right hon. friend the Prime Minister that, inasmuch as it was clearly only intended to deal with the Education Bill, and inasmuch as it had been completely and amply proved by the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury that he did not intend to take this Bill, the purpose of the Government had been fulfilled. They had got their first Bill, and inasmuch as they had not seriously intended to take the second, he suggested to the right hon. Gentleman that he might now agree to the adjournment of the House.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said that if the Shop Hours Bill were finally withdrawn for that day he was very sorry, because it would have gone through with very little debate. But if it was really withdrawn he appealed to the Prime Minister to adjourn the sitting. A feeling of a very undesirable nature had been roused in the House, and in the interest of Parliamentary proceedings it would be wise of the Prime Minister to allow the House now to adjourn.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed on Monday next.

POST OFFICE SITES (EXPENSES).

Order for Commiteee thereupon read, and discharged.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he thought it was very unfortunate that the Government should treat the House in this manner. It was thought that after dropping the Shop Hours Bill the Government would not have attempted to do any more business. A good many Members who had occasioned the trouble just now had not been in the Chamber since that unfortunate occurence took place, and he thought if this debate were to continue now and those Gentlemen were to return, and a little more excitement such as was shown by hon. Members opposite during that debate took place, the right hon. Gentleman would see what an unfortunate step he was taking in continuing the sitting. He trusted that in the interests of the peace and dignity of the House the Government would be content with the business already done, and would accept the Motion which he now moved, to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton) hoped he might make an appeal for this Bill.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): Why should we grant the appeal? We made an appeal, and it was not listened to.

LORD STANLEY: As soon as the Prime Minister returns we can discuss it.

MR. J. H. LEWIS: Why is he not in his place?

LORD STANLEY said the Bill was purely uncontroversial, and it was necessary that it should go up to the other place as soon as possible.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he had not been able to speak twice on the Motion for the adjournment of the Debate. He had not the least desire to press upon the House in the somewhat exceptional circumstances in which they found themselves anything in the nature of a controversial measure. Hon. Members would observe that he had mentioned a future day for the discussion of those Bills which he thought would rouse any feeling. These were interests which all had in common, which really raised no question at all, and he thought perhaps the House would allow this Bill to be considered [OPPOSITION cries of "No"] for which there was a peculiar public reason. If they would consent to that he would immediately move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): Surely the Prime Minister understands that every Bill is controversial after what has taken place.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said the Government had made it totally impossible for a large section of the House to assent to any further business being transacted during the present sitting. He suggested that if this Bill had to go to another place, the other place as well as they would have to sit a little longer. Under the circumstances the Government would be well advised to withdraw this Bill like the others.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would not press this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for the Second Reading read.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) expressed the hope that the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared to press on this Bill. It was a Bill that raised most controversial questions. It was a curious fact that for years and years the Isle of Man Customs had been almost identical, but this year they varied. This Bill raised a most important question in connection with the tobacco duties. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) hoped that in the interests of peace the Motion would be accepted.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) pointed out that the hon. Member for North-West Lanark had a Motion down on the Paper that this Bill should be read a second time this day three months. Under these circumstances, as it raised most controversial matters, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press the Bill..

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that if these Bills were not controversial they could slip through at any time. It was not the question of imperilling the fortunes of any particular Bill. The question was whether they ought to proceed further that day after the feelings of the House had been so stirred, and he warned the Prime Minister that after the way in which the feelings of the House had been outraged no Bill would be regarded as non-controversial. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to take advantage of the feelings of the House after what had been so deeply felt and so deeply resented.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said this Bill was as controversial a Bill as any that could be put before the House. The tobacco duties had been debated at considerable length in this House, and surely in the application of these duties to the Isle of Man this House had a right to express it views. However that might be, it was impossible, after what had occurred that afternoon, to go on with any legislation. The right hon. Gentleman had forced the Welsh Bill through in a very cowardly way and he should be content with that.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said this Bill raised matters of great controversy, re-opening, as it did, the whole of the discussion on the question of stripped and unstripped tobacco.

*MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) said he had been in the House for twenty years and had witnessed many of these scenes, and everybody who had any experience in these matters knew that no good ever came of any business that was attempted after such a scene. After the way in which the House had been treated by the Prime Minister during the last few weeks, culminating in the scandalous scene that day, it was ridiculous for the Prime Minister to adopt his dulcet tone and ask them to go on as if nothing had happened. To-day nothing could be regarded as uncontroversial. No progress whatever would be made, as the right hon. Gentleman must know.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) said he desired to join in the appeal that had been made to the Prime Minister. He was not naturally obstructive but he could not help feeling that after what had taken place no further business should be done that day. If the right hon. Gentleman realised the strength of feeling shown by those who had been always regarded as moderate men he would not proceed further. They had been treated in a manner in which they did not think they ought to the treated in the House of Commons, and feeling as they did they could give no facilities. It was with the bitterest pain and grief that they refused to the Postmaster-General the facilities which he desired, but they did so because they felt it was necessary to make the protest they now made.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he did not think hon. Gentlemen were treating him in a very reasonable spirit. He did not desire to ask the House to proceed with controversial measures. [AN HON. MEMBER: This is a controversial Bill.] Now it was alleged that the scene they had just passed through was of so irritating a description that it was impossible for the House to treat even the most uncontroversial Bill in an uncontroversial spirit. There was a certain amount of business to be got through before the end of the session. If these measures were to be treated as controversial, not only now but on every day, then they had better go on with them in daylight. But if it was understood that these formal Bills were to be treated as such on future occasions, he would be quite ready to come to an arrangement not to take them that afternoon. If, however, it was to be a fight always, then let them fight now. He could assure the House that such scenes as they had had were probably quite as painful to him as to hon. Gentlemen opposite.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) pointed out that the Prime Minister wanted something more to be done as if no scene had occurred. All that had been said by the Opposition was that the state of feeling was such that no further business could be taken that day.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) asked the Prime Minister for one moment to consider the position. He had secured his Bill, although had it been discussed in the ordinary way he would not have got it until three or four o'clock the next morning. Then even his own supporters would have refused to do any more business. Surely the right hon. Gentleman ought to be satisfied with the victory he had gained in obtaining his Bill, though it was gained at the expense of an injury to a highly-strung nation. If the right hon. Gentleman went on with business they would oppose everything through pure cussedness. He admitted his vocabulary was limited, but he did not know any better word. Let the Prime Minister be content with what he had already secured.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) pointed out as an additional reason for not taking this particular Bill that it embodied a proposal with regard to the tobacco duty which differentiated it from the rest of the United Kingdom.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said it was clear from what had fallen from the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark that this could not be treated as an entirely uncontroversial measure. It was not the intention of the Opposition to obstruct night and day in order to prevent anything getting through. All they said was that their nerves and tempers were not in a state to transact business that evening and the Prime Minister must have sufficient knowledge of human nature to realise that that was the case.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR admitted there was something in the contention of hon. Gentlemen opposite that the action of the Government looked like taking advantage of an accident which the Government regretted deeply, though it had had the corollary advantage of allowing the House to rise earlier than it could otherwise do. His object in pressing that business should go on was that he supposed the Opposition for the remainder of the session intended to regard every Bill in its most controversial form. But he understood from the remarks of hon. Gentlemen who had last spoken that he had been mistaken in his general diagnosis. If he might refer to the English of the hon. Member for Woolwich, he would say that his word was very appropriate. "Cussedness" exactly described the situation. He did not wish to press the matter further and in the circumstances he would agree to the adjournment of the debate.

Question put, and agreed to.

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 8th August, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Middlesbrough, Stockton - on - Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Bridlington Corporation Bill [H.L.]: Bristol Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Buxton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Trafford Park Bill [H.L.]; Stretford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [H.L.]; Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [H.L]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill; Selby Urban District Council Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to.

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill. Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Order of the Day for the consideration of the Commons Amendment, read, and discharged.

LEEDS CORPORATION (CONSOLIDATION) BILL.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH): My Lords, with regard to the Notice standing in my name on the Paper, I think the House is entitled to a few words of explanation. The effect of the Notice is to authorise the carrying over of the Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill until the commencement of next session of Parliament, and the circumstances under which I make the suggestion to the House, and which seem to me to justify the proposal, are these. The Bill is one of very great magnitude. It contains 372 clauses. There were about sixty new clauses inserted during its passage through the House of Commons, and the Amendments made were so numerous that I really have not undertaken to count them. I do not deny that the Bill was introduced in the House of Commons in the ordinary time. It was sent to the Police and Sanitary Committee, and was considered by them, but not until 28th June; it was reported from that Committee by 19th July; and it was brought to this House on 25th July, about six weeks after the last date for reading Bills of the kind a second time. Now, my Lords, it is absolutely impossible for myself and the officers of this House to examine a Bill of this magnitude in the time that is left to us. As I have said, it has 372 clauses. It is a consolidation of the whole of the municipal law of Leeds. It is divided into twenty-nine different parts, which deal with such important subjects as water, gas, tramways, electricity, markets, public buildings, parks, burial grounds, building regulations, hackney carriages, advertisements, Courts, sanitary matters, infectious diseases, nuisances, lodging-houses, smoke prevention, rating, finance, and a number of other matters under the comprehensive heading "miscellaneous." We are informed by two Government Departments—the Home Office and the Local Government Board—that, as was expected, they have still supplementary reports to send in. These reports are not in our hands; they could not be presented to us until the Bill appeared in this House, and the Government Departments have not been able to undertake the work in the time at their disposal. In these circumstances, I think it is absolutely impossible for the Bill to pass into law this session, and, as the only way I can suggest for saving the amount of labour which the Police and Sanitary Committee of the other House have bestowed on this Bill, move to carry it over until next session.

Moved, "That the promoters of the Bill have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon, in order to proceed with the Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than three o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

"That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than three o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit after the next meeting of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto, signed by the agent, stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

"That the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to every stage through which the same shall have passed in the present session, and that no new fees be charged in regard to such stages.

"That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same hall have passed during the present session."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, agreed to, and ordered accordingly. Ordered That a message be sent to the Commons to acquaint them with the said Resolution, and to desire heir concurrence.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh

BRADFORD CORPORATION ACT, 1903.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH, who had the following Notice on the Paper: "To move, That the Lord Brougham and Vaux, the Chairman of the Select Committee to whom the Bradford Corporation Bill, 1903, was referred, be permitted to make a Report to this House under the provisions of Section 1 of the Parliamentary Costs Act, 1865, and that such Report shall have effect as from the date on which it is laid upon the Table of this House," said: My Lords, It will not be necessary for me to trouble the House at any length in regard to the Motion standing in my name, because, in consequence of its appearing on the Paper, the matter has been arranged. The Report was a Report on a matter of costs which were agreed to by a Committee presided over by Lord Brougham last year, but the Report was not exactly made to the House, and therefore a technical irregularity occurred. Other steps had to be taken in a definite time from that Report, and they were not taken. One or other of the parties, and to some extent both of them, tried to take advantage of the technical irregularity which had been committed. The matter was brought to my notice as Acting Chairman three months ago, and I came to the conclusion that unless it was rectified in some way or another an injustice would be done. Those who would profit by the irregularity refused for a long time to consent to any compromise, and I thought it necessary a week ago to put this Motion down. I have to-day received communications from both parties that they have agreed to a compromise, to leave the matter in the hands of the Taxing Officer of the House and to abide by his decision. In consequence of that agreement, I do not intend to proceed with the Notice which I have placed on the Paper.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for Amendment of; of residents in Dudley; Rural Deanery of Wigton; North Cumberland Primrose League; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition against; of Edward Owen; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Petition for restriction of sale of; of inhabitants of Carlisle; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (HEALTH).

Statistical Report of the Health of the Navy, for the year 1903.

SECONDARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Report, for the year 1904, by Sir Henry Craik, K.C.B.

POST OFFICE.

Fiftieth Report of the Postmaster-General on the Post Office.

CUSTOMS.

Forty-eighth Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs, for the year ended 31st March, 1904.

INLAND REVENUE.

Forty-seventh Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Inland Revenue, for the year ended 31st March, 1904.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Seventy-second Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, with appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1904.

INDIA (RAILWAYS).

Administration Report on the Railways in India, for the calendar year 1903.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

Annual Report of the President, for the year 1903–1904.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.

Annual Report of the President, for the year 1903–1904.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Fortieth Annual Report of the Registrar-General for the year 1903.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3248. Italy (Province of Lecce).
No. 3249. Italy (South Italy).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVAL SAVINGS BANK.

Account of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interest thereon, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the proceeds of any sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1902–1903.

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Account showing the receipts and expenditure of Naval prize, bounty, salvage, and other moneys between 1st April, 1903, and 31st March 1904.

COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1888.

Order of the Lord Chancellor, dated the 27th of July, 1904, under Section 45 of the Act, ordering that George Walton Walker, Registrar of the County Court of Staffordshire, held at West Bromwich, shall not practice as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of the said George Walton Walker.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Return for the year ended 31st March 1904, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Superannuation Act, 1887, to hold civil employment of profit under public Departments.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie upon the Table.

CHANTREY TRUST.

Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed; minutes of evidence, together with an appendix, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out. (No. 184.)

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Minutes of evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK BILL

Reported, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Moved, "That Standing Order XXI. be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting; and that the Order for receiving the Report of Amendments to the Licensing Bill have precedence of the other Notices and Orders of the day."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

LICENSING BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order).

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of SALISBURY: The first Amendment to Clause 1 standing in my name is to reverse the decision which was come to in Committee, and I therefore think it my duty to explain why I make this proposal. It was on the Motion, I think, of Lord Stanley of Alderley that we put in the words "or refusal" after "renewal." The Government always were of opinion that the question of renewal necessarily involved the question of refusal, and although the words "or refusal," in our opinion added nothing to the efficacy of the clause, we accepted them; but it has since been thought that if the words "or refusal" are left in, you will have to consider putting them in elsewhere where the word "renewal" occurs. Therefore, as I do not think it makes the least difference in the sense, I hope the noble Lord will allow me to strike the words out.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 2. line 2, to leave out the words 'or refusal.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said that as he had the assurance of the noble Marquess that the Government draftsman was of opinion that the point would be covered, and as he felt it a dangerous thing for laymen to meddle with drafting, he accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is in fulfilment of a promise I gave that the Government would put down an Amendment to specifically include justices as among the persons interested who might be heard unless quarter sessions thought it unnecessary.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 2 line 3, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'including the justices of the licensing district.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

LORD FARRER inquired if the noble Marquess had considered whether this met the question in the same way as the Amendment of Lord Coleridge. As he read it, the Amendment moved by the noble Marquess would have this effect, that the justices could only be treated as anyone else interested and quarter sessions were not bound to hear them. If the Amendment standing on the Paper in the name of Lord Coleridge was adopted, he understood that in any event the justices of the licensing district would have the opportunity of being heard. He thought that made a very great difference, especially as a committee of quarter sessions would undertake this work. There was no mention in the clause that it was the committee of quarter sessions which was to have the power of considering it unnecessary to hear the justices. He would like to ask whether it was the whole of quarter sessions, or the committee of quarter sessions, which would have the power of deciding whether it was necessary or not?

*__THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES__ (The Earl of ONSLOW): The noble Lord is correct in saying there is a material difference between the Amendment now before the House and the Amendment standing in the name of the noble and learned Lord opposite. Surely it would be quite unreasonable to expect that in every case the whole cost and expense of the brewster sessions justices appearing before a committee of quarter sessions should be incurred. The desire is to conduct the proceedings under this Bill as cheaply and economically as possible, and it is quite enough to leave it to the confirming authority, after consultation with the local justices, to decide whether or not it is desirable to hear them

EARL SPENCER: I am sorry that the Government are taking this view, because I think there is a very material difference between the two proposals. The noble Earl who has just sat down put it entirely on the point of expense. I do not think that should be seriously considered in a point of this sort. The real point at issue is that the local justices should have a right to be heard in any case where they desire it, whether quarter sessions desire it or not. I think that is an important matter and I trust the House will accept the Amendment of my noble and learned friend rather than the one which has been moved by the noble Marquess. We quite admit that the noble Marquess has come a step forward in our direction, but we do not think he has come far enough.

LORD BELPER: I think the understanding was that it should be put in the form as set out in the noble Marquess's Amendment, and——

EARL SPENCER: I am sure it was not actually understood that it should be exactly in these words.

LORD BELPER: When the noble and learned Lord had moved his Amendment one noble Lord opposite, I think it was Lord Stanley of Alderley, pointed out that if the Amendment was inserted in the place where Lord Coleridge had proposed it would make the appearance of the justices necessary in all cases, and that that was probably unwise. I thereupon thanked the noble Lord and said I quite agreed with him that it should be subject to the saving words "unless quarter sessions think it unnecessary."

EARL SPENCER: I know that Lord Coleridge feels strongly that the way proposed in his Amendment is the proper way of doing it now at all events, whatever may have been the opinion before.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY differed from the statement made by Lord Belper. What he (Lord Stanley) had pointed out was that as the Amendment was drafted by Lord Coleridge he did not get what he wanted, the words being inserted too late. It was then said, on behalf of the Government, that the words could not be transposed at that stage, but that the matter should be considered on Report. His noble friend Lord Farrer had expressed the hope that if the local justices were to be at the mercy of quarter sessions they should be at the mercy of quarter sessions as a whole, and not of a committee of quarter sessions. He took it that the power of determining whether the local magistrates would have the right to appear would be among the powers delegated to the committee of quarter sessions. Brewster sessions were, he thought, entitled to have one justice present when their division was under consideration. If that was so, then a representative of the local magistrates would appear as of right.

LORD FARRER said the second part of his Question had not been answered. Did the words "quarter sessions" mean the whole of quarter sessions or a committee of quarter sessions?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think this is one of the powers which quarter sessions must delegate.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN called attention to the first line of Clause 2, "Where quarter sessions refuse the renewal of a licence." Surely what was meant was "an existing on-licence" because an existing on-licence was referred to all the way through. If the words "existing on" were not inserted the provision might conceivably refer to a new licence given under Clause 4.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: If the noble Earl will move to insert those words, I am quite willing to accept them.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 6, to leave out the word 'a' and insert the words 'an existing on'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl GREY moved to insert in Subsection 1 the words "and in any case when the value of the licensed premises has been enhanced by a refusal to renew any other licence under this Act as if the value had not been so enhanced" so as to secure that the special profits arising from the monopoly value should not be handed over to the owners of existing licences. He said that the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, had been good enough to invite him to bring up this Amendment at this stage of the Bill, and his having done so had encouraged him to hope that the Government, after the consideration they had been enabled to give to the point raised therein, would see their way to adopt the principle of the Amendment. He would be glad to substitute other words if there should be any objection to the phraseology of his Amendment. But if the Government did not see their way to accept his Amendment or adopt a kindred one with the same object, and asked the House to pass the Bill in its present form, then, in his humble opinion, and he thought in the opinion of a great many outside the House, His Majesty's Government would prove themselves unfaithful to the speeches which they had made, by directly consenting to the handing over to the owners of existing licences special profits resulting from monopoly values which did not at the present time belong to the owners of existing licences, but which would be created by the passing of this Bill, and which, therefore, belonged to the community. In the speeches that had been made by the noble Marquess the Leader of the House and by the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal, the position had been taken up of uncompromising hostility to any action which might make His Majesty's Government responsible for handing over any part of the special profits resulting from monopoly rights to favoured individuals. He, therefore, contended that if it was the case, as he maintained it undoubtedly was the case, that the Bill in its present form did hand over profits not yet created but which would be created by the Bill to favoured and privileged individuals, the Government were bound, if they were to be consistent with the speeches that had been made on the most rev. Primate's Amendment by noble Lords who spoke on behalf of the Government, to accept this Amendment.

Having given prolonged and anxious consideration to this point, he said with confidence that he would prefer no time limit and the power to expropriate existing licences by paying compensation measured by their value at the passing of the Act, rather than a time limit with the condition attached that the compensation to be paid should be measured by the value of the licence at the time of its suppression. The plan of no time limit and compensation as at the time of the passing of the Act was a direct inducement in favour of good management, but a time limit with the obligation to pay a rising compensation measured by the value at the time of the suppression did, he maintained, provide a direct inducement to push the sale of alcoholic liquors. He thought that point was obvious. In the one case the owner of an existing licence knew that so long as he conducted his house properly and did not cause the licensing authorities to buy him out he would be obtaining more profit every year until the time limit suppressed him by Act of Parliament; but if there was no time limit and when compensated he would only receive the value of the licence at the time of the passing of the Act there was the utmost inducement to him to introduce principles of good management that would cause his house to remain with the full consent of the licensing authorities. The noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal had described it as an outrage to give brewers any more of these special profits arising from monopoly values than they were now entitled to. He (Lord Grey) naturally concluded, therefore, that when Clause 2 came up for discussion the Government would have shown a readiness to accept an Amendment which was in harmony with their speeches and with the statement of the Home Secretary as to what was the original intention of the Bill. If he had known that the Government would have taken this attitude he would have voted for a time limit, because if the effect of the Bill was to give existing licence-holders the unearned increment arising to surviving houses by the suppression of others, the sooner that was put an end to by a time limit the better.

This unearned increment was the property of the public. It would arise from two causes. An increased value would be added to existing licences by the suppression of neighbouring licences, and there would also be an added value resulting from the growth of population. Both values were special profits arising from monopoly rights, and, therefore, should be secured for the public. He had not asked that the unearned increment resulting from the growth of the community should be reserved for the public, but he asked that that portion which was a direct result of the suppression under the clauses of this Bill of neighbouring competing licences should be reserved for the public and not made a present to the owners of existing licences. He would ask the House to consider this position. There was a village in Hampshire with six licences belonging to the same brewer. Supposing the renewal of half of those licences was refused under the Bill, that reduction would not necessitate any diminution in the amount of alcoholic liquor consumed. The trade crossed the street from the suppressed houses to the remaining houses. The result was that the owner got full compensation for the three houses suppressed, and did the same trade as before with only half the administrative expenses. In that way the owner was compensated twice over. He did not think that was fair, or that it could be the intention of His Majesty's Government. The noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal had said that licence-holders had a pecuniary interest in licences for which they were entitled to compensation if the licences were taken away. That was agreed, but nobody could maintain that they were entitled to that unearned increment in those licences which would be the direct result of the passing of this Bill. The noble Marquess had also said that this was brewers' money, and they must not regard it as if it was a tax levied by the State. He could not look upon this compulsory premium in he light of brewers' money which could not be regarded in the shape of a tax. They all knew that licences were very lightly taxed indeed, and that the money contributed to this compensation fund might very fairly be regarded as money which the State would have a perfect right to take from the owners of existing licences in the shape of a tax. He hoped the Government would be consistent with their professions and accept the principle of his Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 10, after the word 'Act' to insert the words 'and in any case when the value of the licensed premises has been enhanced by a refusal to renew any other licence under this Act as if the value had not been so enhanced.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I should be very sorry if the noble Earl or the House generally thought that the Government were determined to resist any Amendment, and I think your Lordships will find, before the proceedings or to-day are concluded, that that is not at all the spirit in which we think it right to deal with the House of Lords. On the contrary, it is quite clear that it is most proper that Amendments should be pressed upon us, and that if we can find it within our duty to agree with them we should do so. But I think the noble Earl himself must be conscious that the present Amendment is one which it is impossible for the Government to accept. It is neither a practicable Amendment, nor is it, if I may say so, a fair Amendment. Observe the principle with which the noble Earl starts. He says it is unfair and improper that the remaining houses should profit by the increment of custom and trade which they get from the suppression of the licence of a particular house. But the noble Earl does not carry his principle out. He proposes, no doubt, that, if a second house comes up for compensation, the compensation should be reduced by the amount by which it has been enriched through the suppression of the first house. But there are all the other houses; they will all share in the increment, but the noble Earl leaves them undisturbed.

Earl GREY: Until they are suppressed.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: They are not all going to be suppressed. Indeed, I think Parliament and the country would be under a complete misapprehension if they thought that we contemplated suppressing all, or the greater part, of the public-houses. Of course not. We know that these public-houses exist for the benefit of the public, and that whatever mistakes may have been made in regard to licensing laws, or whatever mismanagement there may have been in the licensed trade leading to intemperance, at any rate as a matter of broad principle the public-houses exists for the benefit of the public. In those circumstances we do not propose to suppress half of them, or three-quarters of them. Therefore, there will be an enormous number of public-houses which will get the increased profit and benefit due to the suppression of particular houses and the noble Earl will leave them in that happy position, but he will pick out for this special treatment those houses which afterwards come under the purview of quarter sessions, having been recommended for suppression. He says that these particular houses shall suffer, but the other houses shall continue to have the increment of value which arises from the suppression of a particular house. That is, upon the face of it, unfair, and I suggest it is a system of which your Lordships ought not to approve. It is not only unfair, but it is quite impracticable. After what period of years is this difference to be calculated? Let us say that a particular public-house is suppressed in 1905. Another public-house comes up on the recommendation of brewster sessions to be suppressed in 1910. Are we to to calculate back those five years and see what difference in the then profits of the public-house the suppression of the house five years ago has made? I do not believe that could be done, when you consider that all the time there is considerable change in the profitableness of the trade.

I cannot assent to the noble Earl's conception of this Bill. An instance has been given of two brewers, each owning three houses, It is said, "If the houses of brewer B are suppressed ought brewer A to take the full benefit of the increment arising from the suppression of brewer B's houses"? It seems to be thought that there has been nothing, in the course of the years which have passed, taken out of the pockets of brewer A to balance against that gain. All the time brewer A has paid very large sums by way of contributions. If you look at the schedule of this Bill and capitalise the sums of money which in the course of a great many years will be thrown upon an average public-house such as we may conceive brewer A possesses, your Lordships will find that it amounts to a very large capital sum indeed. The truth is that if you cast up what the brewer gains under this Bill and what he loses, your Lordships will find that the only thing he gains is the compensation money, whereas on the other side of the account he loses the trade of the particular houses, which is equivalent to the compensation money, he loses all the contributions from his remaining houses, and he loses all the increased charges which are thrown upon the remaining houses because they have increased in value in consequence of the suppression of the other houses. I say, therefore, that the brewer is entitled to the extra profit from the increment of custom and trade which comes through the suppression of other houses. That will not at all equal the sums of money I have calculated on the debit side of the account. It will, however, be a set-off, and that is the light in which the Government regard this proposal.

THE EARL OF CREWE expressed regret that the noble Marquess had not seen his way to accept in any form the Amendment moved by Earl Grey. It was perfectly true that the hopes which the noble Marquess held out to his noble friend on the last occasion were of a vague character. The noble Earl (Earl Grey) was merely encouraged to try the arts of persuasion, and was not given to understand that those arts would be successful. It would be unfair, he thought, to say that the Government had treated his noble friend in the way that a cat treated a mouse, though the general effect of their conduct had rather had that appearance. There were one or two arguments used by his noble friend which the noble Marquess had not answered. His noble friend had pointed out, in the first place, that the remaining licence-holders would get one very important advantage which he did not propose to take away from them, namely, the advantage arising from the steady increase of population. The population of Great Britain was a little over 35,000,000 in 1881, and 41,600,000, roughly speaking, in 1901—an increase of upwards of 6,000,000; and one might assume that the increase would be at any rate as great in the future. He could not for a moment imagine, this Bill being what it was, that the number of new licences granted would increase in proportion to the population, or even as fast as they had during the past ten years, and, therefore, that side of the question to which his noble friend alluded certainly ought not to be left out. The noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, had argued that if Earl Grey's Amendment were adopted it would be unfair, because some of the remaining licence-holders would receive an unfair advantage inasmuch as they would get the benefit of the increased business resulting from the suppression of other houses. That was a matter which was very easily righted in the future by imposing a higher tax on the holders of those licences. Then the noble Marquess argued the case as between brewer A and brewer B. He (Lord Crewe) could not believe it possible that the increased contribution would at all approach in amount the extra profits which would be gained by the suppression of public-houses. The noble Marquess had forgotten one important item on the credit side of the balance sheet, namely, the great saving in the expense of management. He was glad to have detected one hopeful observation in the course of the noble Marquess's speech—the observation that the House would find before the proceeedings closed that the Government were not entirely obdurate to Amendments. It would be interesting to know what Amendments the noble Marquess was prepared to accept.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND said he was not much impressed by the population argument that had been adduced. If the population increased all over the country in equal ratio, or if the fund which was created under the Bill was a general fund for the whole country, there might be something to be said for it; but it must be remembered that the population shifted even if it increased, and it was possible to have a decreasing population in certain places and public-houses going down in value, although the general population might be increasing. He had supported His Majesty's Government in resisting Amendments during the Committee stage, but he must say he had considerable sympathy with the Amendment now before the House. He did not entirely agree with all that had been said by its mover in its favour. He was not sure, for instance, that he agreed about the unearned increment belonging to the public. He was not very much impressed by the objections to the Amendment which were made by the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal. If there was a difficulty in five or ten years, or whatever the length of time might be, in discovering what the value of a licence was at the passing of the Act, or when the first licensed house had been suppressed, surely that might be got over by having a general valuation of every public-house at the time of the passing of the Act. He did not in the least follow the noble Marquess in what he said about this only affecting the first public-house which was suppressed. No doubt the value of the other houses would go up when the first public-house was suppressed, and when the second house was suppressed the value of the remaining houses would go up one step further. What the noble Earl aimed at in his Amendment was that when any of these houses were suppressed the increased value to the remaining houses should be ascertained, and he (the noble Duke) saw no difficulty in that. But he did see a difficulty, and he confessed it appeared to him an insurmountable one. He could not see, particularly after a course of years, how in very many cases anybody could say how much the value of a licence had been enhanced by the fact that other licences had been extinguished and how far it had been enhanced by other circumstances. He confessed that that seemed to him a great difficulty, and one which it was almost impossible to overcome, and unless some noble Lord who was accustomed to assessing values could assure him that it could be done, he was afraid that with every wish to support the Amendment he would be compelled to vote against it.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said that the moment the Bill became law they would at once have a registered value of every public-house, because under the schedule every public-house would begin its contribution to the fund at a certain definite declared value. If they were to nail the houses to that value, then in the most automatic way they would be able to ascertain the increased value as years went on. The Bill, he was afraid, was certain to become law with all its imperfections, and he thought they must look to another body and to another tribunal to remedy its errors. There was not the slightest doubt that the Bill, when it came to be law, would not be accepted by a large number of people in the country. The people had power, through their representative House, to put on such taxes as they pleased upon licences, and to take the increment value in relief of the general taxes, and as that would be a part of the taxation of the country their Lordships would have no voice in regard to it.

The Marquess of HUNTLY agreed in spirit with the Amendment now before the House, though he could not go so far as the noble Earl did. He himself had an Amendment on the Paper dealing with this matter, and which provided that when refusing the renewal of a licence in any parish, or the parish adjoining it, previous payments of compensation for licensed premises in those parishes should be taken into account when determining the amount to be paid as compensation for the premises. He agreed with the noble Duke that it would be a very difficult thing to determine the enhanced value, but the course he proposed was to leave it to quarter sessions to consider and determine upon each case when it came up.

***The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS** (The Marquess of Lansdowne): My noble friend, Lord Crewe, hinted that His Majesty's Government had not treated the noble Earl below the Gangway quite as fairly as he would have desired in the matter of this Amendment.

The Duke of Northumberland.

The Earl of CREWE: I did not say unfairly, nor did I mean unfairly.

***The Marquess of LANSDOWNE**: We were impressed by the earnestness with which the noble Earl (Earl Grey) brought this matter before the House, and we did re-examine the whole question with the desire to find, if possible, some way of meeting his criticism, but we came regretfully to the conclusion that it was impossible to accept the Amendment, and I do not think during the course of this evening's conversation anyone has answered what I conceive to be the two main arguments put forward by my noble friend the Lord Privy Seal. What are those two arguments? In the first place, my noble friend pointed out that it was absolutely impossible, after a lapse of time, for any authority so to dissect the then value of a licence as to distinguish that part of its increased value which was due to the suppression of other licences. That was the objection which was supported by the noble Duke behind me, who clearly admitted that it was a valid objection. The increase in the value of the licence may have been due to change in the circumstances of the locality, to a movement of population, or it may have been due to the energy or enterprise of the holder of the licence. How is it possible to say with confidence that such and such a part of the increment is due to those causes, and such and such a part due to the fact that at a certain time adjoining licences were suppressed as redundant? I notice that the noble Earl opposite suggested to the House that where licences were suppressed it was fair to assume that the whole of the value of the trade passed to the surviving houses. If, however, it is true that when you suppress let us say ten out of twenty, licences, the whole of the trade of the suppressed houses passes to the surviving ten, then what becomes of the great argument of the noble Viscount's Commission—an argument which, I think, has been universally adopted—that an inordinate proportion of licences leads to the prevalence of intemperance?

What was the other argument put forward by the noble Marquess? He pointed out the gross unfairness of the manner in which the Amendment of the noble Earl would operate. Is not that quite clear? Let us take the crudest and simplest illustration. Let us assume there are four licences, A, B, C, and D. You suppress A as redundant. A's trade, according to the noble Earl, passes to B, C, and D. In process of time you proceed to suppress licence B, and, according to the noble Earl, you are to deprive B of any compensation for the trade which came to him owing to the suppression of A. Well, but the remaining two licences, C and D, to each of which has passed *ex hypothesi* one-third of A's trade, continue to enjoy their share of the cake, and will so continue until they are suppressed. Any attempt to make an arrangement of this kind would operate most unfairly, and, therefore, much as we regret not being able to accept the views of the noble Earl, we are quite unable to agree to his Amendment.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said he was lost in astonishment at the argument about unfairness. When they abolished one licence, they thereby increased the value of certain other licences. They then proceeded to abolish one of these remaining licences, and refused to compensate the licence-holder in respect of the increased value which he had derived from the abolition of the first house. The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs contended that that would be unfair to the remaining houses, but when they came to abolish those other houses they would treat them in the same way.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Marquess's argument would be excellent if we were going to suppress all the licences.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said the case did not arise until they proceeded to abolish one or more of the remaining houses, and when that time arose the holders of the remaining licences were treated in exactly the same way. Therefore he could not see any unfairness in the matter.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY pointed out that the indisputable difficulties in which the Government were placed on this subject were due to the absence of a time limit. He did not wish to argue that question again, but it might be useful to remember this in future discussions, for it was not to be supposed that discussion would end in the present session of Parliament.

EARL SPENCER: I do not propose to go into the question of the time limit, though I entirely fall in with the view expressed by the most rev. Primate. In the case of three houses belonging to one brewer and one being suppressed, there is no difficulty. We had the case, which possibly the noble Marquess, the Lord Privy Seal, will recognise, and which was put so ably by my noble friend behind me, of property in the Strand. That is an exact illustration of what might be done in the case of a brewer whose house is suppressed and the value of whose other houses goes up. There is no difficult about that. But it is said that a difficulty comes in where the enhanced value belong to another owner, and that in such a case it would be exceedingly difficult to assess the enhanced value because it might come not only from the suppression of other houses, but from other circumstances. I admit there is some difficulty in that matter, but it is not an insurmountable difficulty. Surely it could be argued whether the enhanced value came from the suppression of an adjoining house or from other sources. Therefore, in that respect I do not think there would be any serious difficulty. I very much regret that His Majesty's Government seem to be obdurate on this matter. I did hope that they might have made some concession to the noble Earl, but after the statement of the noble Marquess the Foreign Secretary that this point has been fully discussed by the Government, I am afraid there is little chance of their giving way. If the noble Earl goes to a division on the Amendment I shall certainly vote with him.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: Does not all this discussion arise from a misconception of the word "compensation"? If it were compensation out of a public fund there would be a great deal of force in what noble Lords opposite say; but as this fund is provided by the brewers themselves, and the whole intention of the Bill is that we shall act with as little injustice as possible to them, is it unfair that we should say that if as the result of the suppression of adjoining licences the brewers have to pay increased contributions for a number of years to the fund, then if a further licence is suppressed they should get full compensation for its then value under the Bill? The noble Earl who moved this Amendment said the brewer would get increased business and pay nothing for it; but supposing he has one of these houses which will never be suppressed, he will go on paying for all time, or, at any rate, for such time as quarter sessions imposes it, his contribution to this fund, and the only advantage he will get out of that contribution, assuming that he is not going to have his house suppressed, will be the increased value that is given to his remaining licence. I really think that, considering the number of years that many of these licensees will have to contribute, it is not unreasonable to give them the advantage of full compensation for the increased value of their premises out of the fund to which they themselves have contributed.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted" their Lordships divided:—Contents, 21; Not-Contents, 46.

CONTENTS.

Ripon, M.

Camperdown, E. [*Teller.*]
Chesterfield, E.
Chichester, E.
Crewe, E.
Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Spencer, E.

Temple, E.

Peel, V.

Chester, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. David's, L. Bp.

Brassey, L.
Braye, L.
Denman, L.
Farrer, L.
Mendip, L. (*V. Clifden.*)
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stanmore, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*) (*L. President.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Bradford, E.
Cowley, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.

Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Hardwicke, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]

Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.

Addington, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Balfour, L.

Belper, L.
Glanusk, L.
Hatherton, L.
Iveagh, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Rathmore, L.
Redesdale, L.
St. Oswald, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Suffield, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I have now to move an Amendment which is not on the Paper, and which I may perhaps describe as the first twig of the olive branch to which the noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal referred just now. It is one of those Amendments which the Government hope to incorporate in the Bill in order to meet the wishes of noble Lords opposite. It will be in the recollection of your Lordships that in Committee Earl Beauchamp moved an Amendment to a clause later on in the Bill with the view of securing to the tenant the value of the trade fixtures in the case of licences not being renewed, and I propose, with your Lordships' consent, to insert in Clause 2, line 10, after the word "Act" the words "and including in that value the amount of any depreciation of trade fixtures arising by reason of the refusal to renew the licence." It will be remembered that Earl Beauchamp suggested that the licence-holder should be paid full compensation for the fixtures, but it is quite possible that when the house is closed the owner of the fixtures may be able to remove them at once to another house. Therefore, the only amount which we think he is reasonably entitled to is the depreciation in their value by reason of the house being closed.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, line 10, after the word 'Act' to insert 'and including in that value the amount of any depreciation of trade fixtures arising by reason of the refusal to renew the licence.'"—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said it was difficult to follow an Amendment not on the Paper, but the effect, as it appeared to him, of inserting the words in the Amendment after the word "Act" and not after the word "value" would be that the value of the fixtures would be added to the value as a running concern; that was to say, it would augment the compensation. It seemed to him that the value of a public-house when closed was what it would be sold for, and the Amendment rather suggested that the fixtures were to be valued twice over. The words which the noble Earl proposed to add should, he thought, be inserted after the word "value."

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I do not know whether we are to understand that the Opposition do not wish us to press this Amendment. It was an Amendment suggested by one of their own side, and we have done our best to meet their wishes; but if the noble Lord opposite does not wish to have it, we are quite prepared to withdraw it.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said he was not opposing the Amendment, but only the way it was drafted.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY then moved the Amendment standing in his name to which he had already referred. He understood the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture to say that it was only fair that if a person had been paying these large sums as insurance they should receive full compensation on a licence being taken away; but if it was provided, as he suggested, that previous payments of compensation were to be taken into consideration the annual payments by the trade to the fund would not be so high. He thought it would be much better to leave to quarter sessions the decision on any case that might be brought up.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 12, after the word 'premises' to insert the words 'provided that when refusing the renewal of a licence in any parish, or the parish adjoining it, previous payments of compensation for licensed premises in those parishes be taken into account when determining the amount to be paid as compensation for the premises.'"—(*The Marquess of Huntly.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Probably the House will agree in thinking that as we could not accept Lord Grey's Amendment, it is not likely we can accept the noble Marquess's. The principle raised is precisely the same. There are, however, certain limiting words in the noble Marquess's Amendment. I think injustice would probably arise out of the limitations themselves which would be in addition to, and not in diminution of, the objections we had to the Amendment of the noble Earl.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is merely a drafting one. Your Lordships may remember that Lord Davey did not like the form in which the Amendment was proposed to be inserted in Committee. It is evidently a mistake to have the words "for a year or from year to year." Either one or the other must be taken as the standard, and we therefore propose to strike out the words "for a year or."

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 28, to leave out the words 'for a year or.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is merely for the purpose of providing for the case where costs are incurred by the Commissioners of

Inland Revenue in carrying out the Act. We propose that those costs should be either paid out of the compensation funds or by the parties.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 2, line 34, to insert as a new sub-section the words: '(4) Any costs incurred by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue on an appeal from their decision to the High Court under this section shall, unless the High Court order those costs to be paid by some party to the appeal other than the Commissioners, be paid out of the amount to be paid as compensation.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY moved an Amendment limiting the borrowing powers of local authorities for the purpose of paying compensation "to a period not exceeding seven years." His object in moving the Amendment, he explained, was to avert what he believed to be a very real danger by giving to the local authority an unlimited power to borrow. Such an unlimited power might, in certain cases have the effect of tying for many years to come the hands of those magistrates who wished to suppress licences, but who would find that their predecessors had mortgaged the security of the compensation fund. The Amendment suggested seven years as an appropriate term of limitation, but it was not the exact term of years he cared about so much as the fact that there should be a very definite limit laid down to the power given to the local authority. He earnestly hoped the Government would accept the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 29, after the word 'borrow' to insert the words 'for a period not exceeding seven years.'"—(*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.*)

LORD BELPER: As I stated in answer to the most rev. Primate on the Committee stage, the Government are in sympathy with his view that there ought to be some limit placed upon the term of years for which authorities are allowed to borrow, but the Government think seven years in all cases might be too short. As this is merely putting in a maximum which cannot be exceeded, but which in the great majority of cases it will be very undesirable even to come up to, the Government propose that the limit should be fifteen years. Under Clause 6 the House will see that Sub-section (b) provides for the enforcement or any security given for borrowed money and for the time within which money borrowed is to be replaced. The Government think that would be the most convenient place to put in the limit. If the House consents to the limit of fifteen years, the sub-section would then read—

"(*b*) Provide for the enforcement of any security given for money borrowed and for the time, not exceeding fifteen years, within which money borrowed is to be replaced."

The Secretary of State has the power under this clause to consider the circumstances of each case. He would probably not make any general limit. It is obvious that the circumstances in each case must vary largely, and that different cases would have to be considered on their merits. It is my own view that in the great majority of cases fifteen years would be a longer period than would be at all necessary. However, the Government propose to put that in as a maximum, leaving the Secretary of State power to say in particular cases what smaller period should be allowed.

EARL SPENCER: The noble Lord objects to the place where it is proposed to insert the Amendment. I myself am responsible for that, and I say at once that I have no objection to its being transferred. But I must say I do object to the extension from seven to fifteen years. I think that is much too long a time, and it would limit extremely the power of the authorities to reduce licences. It is an important matter that we should not encourage these authorities to borrow to such a large extent as would cripple our hands in the future, and I would urge the Government to accept a limit of ten years as a compromise.

LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH said the great tendency in these days was for public bodies to borrow almost without limit and without stint. The Government proposed that the term of years should be limited by rules to be made by the Secretary of State, and in all probability the term would be very much less than the extreme limit proposed to be inserted. There was one thing he would like to have made quite clear. How would the interest and sinking fund charges be paid during the time for which the money was lent? Would they be paid out of the rates or out of the compensation fund?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Out of the compensation fund.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS appealed to the Government to make some concession on the question of the number of years. He hoped they would see their way to accept the suggestion of the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition and fix ten years as the period. There was a great tendency on the part of local authorities to borrow up to their full power, and he was strongly opposed to a longer period than ten years being agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am largely responsible for having laid before the Government the strong view which the most rev. Primate and other noble Lords take on this particular Amendment. We thought it was a point upon which a concession might be made, and it is with a feeling of no little disappointment that I find that our effort has only led to an enlarged demand——

EARL SPENCER: No.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Well, enlarged above our concession, at any rate, which does not encourage us to pursue these moderate courses. I really do think this is a matter for compromise. As the Government sent the Bill up to this House, there was no limit. We proposed to trust entirely to the rules of the Secretary of State. Then several noble Lords represented to us that they did not trust the Secretary of State, or, rather, that they did not trust future Secretaries of State, and they thought a limit ought to be fixed in the Bill. We have thought it right to make some concession to meet their view, and have offered fifteen years, but it would be asking too much to ask us to go lower than that. We do not desire to indicate for a moment that the limit should be seven, ten, twelve, or fifteen years. We do recognise this, that we cannot allow a local body, even quarter sessions, to pledge futurity beyond a certain limit. We have always intended that a limit should be fixed by rules, and we are prepared to extend our view by transferring it from the rules to the text of the Bill. The fifteen years proposed is the maximum, but it will be quite possible for the Secretary of State to make the term shorter. If your Lordships agree to this Amendment it will, however, be impossible for the Secretary of State to make it longer.

THE EARL OF CREWE expressed regret that His Majesty's Government had not been more open to a deal than they had proved to be, but he did not know that it was any use pursuing the subject any further. It seemed to him that this matter had never been thoroughly discussed. Possibly some member of the Government might be able to indicate the sort of cases in which it would be desirable or necessary for the local authority to borrow for such a long period. It meant mortgaging straight away about half their entire capital, which on the face of it seemed extraordinary.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said they did not distrust the Secretary of State or any particular office, but they thought it was undesirable to leave the detail work of a system of this kind more than was really necessary to any executive officer of the Government. Parliament ought to lay down definite rules so far as it could as to the system on which a Bill of this kind was to be carried out, and leave as little as it could to be regulated by executive regulations. He entered a protest against a policy of this kind in regard to such important matters.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I now propose to leave out Sub-section 6 of Clause 3. That is the sub-section which provides for returns which the Secretary of State may call for from the districts, but we think that the provisions should have a wider scope. We think that Parliament would probably like to have returns not merely with regard to refusals to renew, but also with regard to new licences. Therefore, I propose to strike out the provision here and put it in later on where it will extend to new licences as well as renewals.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 32, to leave out Sub-section 6."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

EARL SPENCER: In this Amendment the noble Marquess proposes to strike out the sub-section which deals with returns in regard to old licences, but in the new clause which he is to move later on the provision is confined to new licences. I agree that the more information we have on this subject, both as regards old licences and new, the better. The new clause which the noble Marquess is to move after Clause 6 provides that quarter sessions, with respect to their own action and that of the justices of licensing districts under this Act, and the confirming authority, with respect to new licences granted under this Act, shall in each year make such returns to the Secretary of State as the Secretary of State may require. Does not the striking out of Sub-section 6 of Clause 3 and the insertion of this new clause later on result in the returns being confined to new licences.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The words are:—

"Quarter sessions, with respect to their own action and that of the justices of licensing districts under this Act."

That is to say, all their action under this Act. And it goes on—

"And the confirming authority, with respect to new licences granted under this Act, shall in each year make such returns,"

so that it covers both returns. But I will take care that it is looked into so that it is quite clear.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The reason of the next Amendment is this. The words as they stand in the Bill would seem to exclude the borough justices. The provision is that—

"The justices of a licensing district, on the grant of a new on-licence, may attach to the grant,"

Borough justices act in these respects by committees. Therefore, it is necessary to have words to include the committee as well as the whole body.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 3, line 39, to leave out the words 'of a licensing district.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, on Sub-section 2, which provides that the justices, on the grant of a new on-licence, may attach to the grant of the licence such conditions as they think proper in the interests of the public, subject to the provisions of the section, moved, after "on the grant of a new on-licence," to insert "or of an order sanctioning the transfer or removal of a licence under Section 50 of the Licensing Act, 1872." He said that unless this Amendment was inserted it would be possible for the magistrate to grant the transfer of a licence in a case in which a licence-holder wished to remove from an unprofitable district to a profitable district. He did not say it would be obligatory, but it would be permissive for magistrates to transfer that licence as a removal. Section 50 of the Act of 1872 gave very wide powers for the transfer of a licence. It enabled magistrates not merely to remove the licence to another part of the brewster sessional district, but actually over the whole of the county. If, for instance, a firm of brewers had a licence in Skipton and wanted to remove it to Rotherham or Doncaster, technically it could be done as a transfer. He was not saying that the justices were likely to avail themselves of this power, but it ought not to be possible under the Act for them to do so. The Government had insisted very strenuously on every advantage which might fairly be claimed for the trade in connection with the closing of public-houses, but nobody could say that, if a man had a public-house which was not yielding any great profit in the place where it was, he had any claim at all to be allowed to migrate to another place and ask the justices to transfer his licence. He thought it important that Parliament should prevent the possibility of that which was obviously a new licence being treated as a transfer of an old licence, and thereby escaping the conditions laid down in Clause 4.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 3, line 40, after the word 'licence' to insert the words 'or of an order sanctioning the transfer or removal of a licence under Section 50 of the Licensing Act, 1872.'"—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): I do not think it is desirable to place an additional hindrance in the way of magistrates doing what they have a right to do. This is an entirely new idea that magistrates may abuse the power which they have exercised ever since the year 1872. I observe that no one has suggested, either in the discussion the other night or to-night, that there is any instance of magistrates abusing their power in this direction, and I do not see why it should be suggested that they are likely to do so in the future.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY pointed out, in reply to the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack, that from 1872 up to the present time there had been no particular reason why anybody should ask for a transfer rather than a new licence in the event of going from one part of the country to another; but after this Bill passed there would be the greatest possible inducement to the owners of public-houses to try by any scheme they possibly could to escape the conditions which, under Clause 4, attached to new licences granted after the passing of the Act. Under that clause new licences were to be subject to a charge for monopoly value, but that condition would not apply to a transfer. He earnestly hoped the House would obtain from the Government some promise that they would not be deprived in this way of what they had hoped had been gained in Clause 4.

EARL SPENCER: I do not at all follow the argument of the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack. We do not desire to show any want of regard for the magistrates. They carry out their duties, no doubt, very properly, and I do not want to impugn their conduct in the least; but an entirely different state of things will arise when the Bill comes into force. There will be a difference between old and new licences, and there will be a great desire on the part of a great many people, particularly the brewers, to avoid the new licences on account of the conditions which, under Clause 4, would attach to them. Under the Act of 1828 a transfer can be made on account of expropriation, or fire, or certain other specified circumstances. We do not wish to interfere with that at all. We think that in those cases it would be quite fair that a licence-holder should remain in the same position, but the Act of 1872 gives a general power beyond those exceptions in the Act of 1828 which we think ought to be restricted. I hope His Majesty's Government will consider this. The noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal said this was a trifling thing the other night, but I think it is a very serious matter indeed.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: When I described the Amendment which I moved the other night as a trifling Amendment I did so because it was only designed to make abundantly clear what was pretty clear already, and as the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack told the House, the Amendment I then moved was quite unnecessary. The real question is, how far do you trust the magistrates? It is not asking too much of this House to believe that brewster sessions will not be a party to a palpable evasion of the whole spirit of an Act of Parliament. If brewster sessions are not reliable, at any rate quarter sessions will not be a party to such a proceeding, and, as your Lordships will remember, these transfers cannot have effect until they have been confirmed by quarter sessions, just as in the case of an ordinary new licence. I confess I think it does not do, in passing an Act of this kind, to begin by saying we are going to give enormous powers to quarter sessions, and then say in another part of the Act that we do not trust quarter sessions. That is inconsistent. If you are going to trust quarter sessions at all, you must trust them in that particular, and I think we may leave it to quarter sessions to see that nothing contrary to the public interest is done under the protection of this clause.

THE EARL OF CREWE said it seemed to him scarcely a reasonable charge to bring against them that they did not trust the magistrates in this matter. He was inclined to ask noble Lords opposite, when they talked of a culpable evasion of the Act, what it was they exactly meant. In his opinion, it was not right that compensation should be paid in the case of a transfer unless that transfer was of the sort indicated under the old Act; that was to say, the result of expropriation, fire, tempest, or some natural calamity of that kind. Where a licence was transferred from an old house to a new one they did not consider that a case could be made out for compensation under this Act. If the Bill was left as the noble Marquess desired to leave it, quarter sessions would understand that it was intended that in all these cases of transfer the licence should be regarded as a transferred licence and should not be treated as a new licence. The noble Marquess had given no indication to quarter sessions as to the views of His Majesty's Government on this matter, and it seemed to him that they would, knowing what had passed in Parliament and reading the Act as it stood, undoubtedly assume that in all cases it was intended that the transfer should be treated as an old licence and not as a new one.

***THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS** pointed out that the Amendment would increase the power of the local justices; they would attach to the licence such conditions as to payments and tenure and other matters as they might think proper in the public interest, which power they apparently had not. The matter was important, and he implored the Government to consider the Amendment favourably.

LORD FARRER said he should support the Amendment.

***THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON** gave an illustrative case. If a licence which was being given up in, say, Bethnal Green because the house was unprofitable was allowed to be transferred, say, to the large and rising district of Clayton, that licence would be subject to none of the conditions which would attach to a new licence; and if at a subsequent period the house in Clayton was shut up, it would be compensated for at a value very considerably higher than if the compensation money had been granted in respect of the house in Bethnal Green. It was monstrously unfair that a man should be able to take a valueless licence and put it down in a prosperous district, and then not be subject to the conditions attaching to a new licence.

On Question "That those words be there inserted," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 26; Not-Contents, 47.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Ripon, M.

Camperdown, E.
Chesterfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Chichester, E.
Crewe, E.
Grey, E.
Spencer, E.
Temple, E.

Westmeath, E.

Knutsford, V.
Peel, V.

Chester, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. David's, L. Bp.

Braye, L.

Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Dunboyne, L.
Emly, L.
Farrer, L.
Hatherton, L.
Mendip, L. (*V. Clifden.*)
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Welby, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Salisbury, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.

Lansdowne, M.

Clarendon, E. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Bradford, E.
Cawdor, E.
Cowley, E.
Dartrey, E.

Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Hardwicke, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Northesk, E.
Onslow, E.

Selborne, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Hardinge, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)

Addington, L.
Allerton, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Belper, L.
Burton, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Glanusk, L.
Iveagh, L.
Kenyon, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Rathmore, L.
Redesdale, L.
St. Oswald, L.
Stalbridge, L.
Suffield, L.
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is a provision for the case of a transfer of a licence of longer duration than the ordinary annual licence. If, for instance, the holder of a seven-years licence died before the expiration of the seven years and a transfer were granted, it would only be a transfer for the remainder of the term, not for a new term of seven years. The provision in the Amendment that any reference to special sessions in any enactment relating to transfers or protection orders shall include a reference to the general annual licensing meeting is an Amendment of the law that has long been needed.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 26, at end of line to insert the words 'and (*b*) any transfer of the licence shall, subject to any conditions attached thereto on the grant, have effect for the remainder of the term of the licence, and may be granted at a general annual licensing meeting as well as at special sessions, and any reference to special sessions in any enactment relating to transfers or protection orders shall include a reference to the general annual licensing meeting.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL GREY moved to amend Sub-section (4), which, as the Bill passed through Committee, provided that the payments made under the conditions attached to new licences so as to secure the monopoly value to the public should be "dealt with in the same manner as the duties on local taxation licences within the meaning of Section 20 of the Local Government Act, 1888." The noble Earl proposed that the words quoted should be left out, and that others should be inserted providing that the payments should be allocated to such purposes not properly chargeable to the rates as the confirming authority should determine. He said experience had shown that the appropriation of drink profits to the relief of the rates had worked very badly. He understood his noble friend the Lord Privy Seal, on behalf of the Government, was disposed to look favourably on the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 28, to leave out from the word 'collected' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'and allocated to such purposes not properly chargeable to the rates as the confirming authority determine.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The Government feel that there is a good deal to be said for the view that the money collected in respect of the new licences should not be devoted to the local taxation account as provided in the Bill; but we have found some difficulty in arriving at a confident conclusion as to the proper substitute. It is not clear what "purposes not properly chargeable to the rates" might be. The phrase is very wide. The Government do not wish to be obdurate, however, and will accept the Amendment on the understanding that on the Third Reading, or in another place, it may be necessary to modify the proposal. There will have to be consequential Amendments; for instance, a provision in the rule clause to give the Home Secretary power to make rules relating to the sub-section.

EARL SPENCER: I agree almost entirely with the noble Earl, but I am not sure that the Amendment does not go too far, and will therefore require some limitation as suggested by the noble Marquess. For instance, under the Amendment as it stands the money might be handed over to infirmaries or for a variety of objects.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY doubted whether the Amendment, seeing that it proposed to take away money now allocated to the rates, was not a breach of privilege.

Lord FARRER suggested, as a way out of the difficulty, that the money should go to the Imperial Exchequer.

The LORD BISHOP of CHESTER was glad the Government had given way, and said this clause should go down to posterity as Lord Grey's clause. It was his education of the country that had made it possible for the Government to introduce this clause. He had brought home to the mind of the country, in a way that nobody else had ever succeeded in doing, a sense of the vast amount of what ought to be public money which had been placed in private hands by our system of licensing hitherto. When he said that a ring fence ought to be built round all new licences, he had used an expression which had gone home to the public intellect and imagination. He expressed regret, which he knew was widely shared, that the clause seemed in some danger of being outmanœuvred as a result of the vote which had just gone against Earl Grey on another point. He hoped it might not be so.

The Earl of CREWE shared in the pleasure expressed by the right rev. Prelate at the acceptance by the Government of the substance of the Amendment proposed by the noble Lord, Earl Grey. He thought it would have been the greatest possible misfortune if that Amendment had been rejected. But there was one feature in the Amendment which made him also glad that the Government had not accepted it exactly as it stood, and he believed that it was still capable of some further Amendment. His point was that it seemed to be a very novel principle to hand over to a body of magistrates complete discretion over the allocation of money raised by rates, the magistrates, as such, having nothing whatever to do with the rates.

Lord BELPER: It has nothing to do with the rates; we simply call them "charges".

The Earl of CREWE admitted that he was incorrect in using the word rates; he should, of course, have used the word "charges". He hoped that to-morrow, or in another place, the Government would be ready with some proposed Amendment which would enable those sums to be dealt with in a manner more in consonance with tradition and the general custom of dealing with public money.

Earl GREY said that by the courtesy of the noble Marquess he had seen the Amendment to his Amendment, which he understood the Government were prepared to accept. He therefore begged leave to withdraw his own Amendment with the object of inserting that suggested by the Government.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Earl GREY then moved an Amendment to leave out, in page 4, line 28, from the word "be" to the end of the subsection in order to insert the following words, "allocated to such purposes of public benefit not chargeable to the rates as the confirming authority determine."

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 28, to leave out from the word 'collected' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'allocated to such purposes of public benefit not chargeable to the rates as the confirming authority determine.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

***Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY** said this was a new Amendment, and it now had a double vice. It affected the privileges of the House of Commons and gave to the magistrates who were not representative the power of spending money raised by the taxes.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I have a small drafting Amendment to carry out the same object as that on which I have already moved, namely, to bring the borough magistrates in where, as it stands, only the county magistrates would be. It is, at the bottom of page 4, and at the top of page 5, line 1, to leave out the words "of the licensing district" and insert "authorised to grant the licence."

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 4, line 41, and page 5, line 1, to leave out the words, 'of the licensing district' and insert the words 'authorised to grant the licence.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is to take out the words in the second sub-section of Clause 5, beginning in line 9, which provides the power of quarter sessions to make rules regarding their own committee, and to put those words in further down in the page. The reason I submit this Amendment to your Lordships is this: the place in which these words stand in the Bill only brings in these powers inferentially. That is always an undesirable way of legislating. We want a positive enactment, and that is done by leaving out the words at this point and inserting them later.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 5, page 5, line 9, to leave out from the word 'them' to the second word 'and' in line 11, and insert the words 'under this section.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 5, page 5, line 16, at end of line to insert as a separate paragraph, the words 'Quarter sessions may make rules to be approved by a Secretary of State, for the mode of appointment of committees under this section, and for the number, the quorum, and (so far as procedure is not otherwise provided for) the procedure of those committees.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next is a small verbal Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 21, to leave out the word 'but' and insert the word 'and.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL SPENCER: I do not think the noble Marquess has any Amendment to Sub-section 4 of Clause 5.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: No.

EARL SPENCER: I rise to ask a Question. I have given no notice of any Amendment, but we have had a great deal of discussion with regard to the justices having the right to appear. In Sub-section 4 there is power given to the justices of any borough, not being a county borough, but having a separate commission of the peace to appoint one of their number to act with reference to the determination of any question as to the refusal to renew, etc. I desire to know whether the Government think it is desirable to allow a justice of the brewster sessions also to be appointed to the committees. That would in some way mitigate the difficulties which we feel will arise by the omission of an absolute right of the justices to appear before them.

LORD BELPER: May I point out that this committee is a committee of quarter sessions, and it is appointed by quarter sessions. It is laid down that one member of the justices of a borough shall be appointed or that they shall be represented. I do not think that in many counties you could make an enactment that every brewster sessions should be represented. Of course, the magistrates on the committee of quarter sessions are magistrates of brewster sessions, and under the rules and regulations which are to be laid down with regard to their appointment, care would be taken, so far as possible, that the different parts of the county should be fairly represented on the quarter sessions committee. But probably the numbers would be very large in the case of a large country and would therefore prevent a magistrate from each brewster sessions being on the committee. There also might be other reasons why it would not be possible to adopt this suggestion. The point is a little outside the question we were discussing before, which was whether the magistrates from brewster sessions should be always present and enabled to be heard.

[The subject then dropped.]

LORD BELPER: I have an Amendment, which is not on the Paper, to

Clause 6, in page 6, line 2. This is to carry out the suggestion which I made on behalf of the Government that a limit of years for borrowing should be inserted in this clause. My Amendment is, in Clause 6, page 6, line 2, after the word "time" to insert "not exceeding fifteen years."

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, page 6, line 2, after the word 'time' to insert 'not exceeding fifteen years.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY was of opinion that the hand of the Government was very heavy indeed upon those who had tried to obtain a limitation of time, but of course he knew that they would lose everything if they did not take what they could get. He presumed that they must therefore accept the Amendment, although he earnestly desired that at some future stage of the Bill it might be found possible to make the limit ten years rather than fifteen years. He believed that they would never regret it if they made it ten years and that they would regret it without doubt if they made it fifteen years.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendments are consequential on the Amendment of the noble Lord Earl Grey. The first is, in Clause 6, page 6, line 5, after the word "fund" to insert the words "and of any sums paid in respect of new licences." The second is, in line 6, after the word "sessions" to insert "and so far as respects sums paid for new licences, and the confirming authority." The object of these Amendments is to place the sum of money which will accrue under the noble Earl's Amendment under the rule-making powers of the confirming authorities.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, page 6, line 5, after the word 'fund' to insert the words 'and of any sums paid in respect of new licences.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 6, after the word 'sessions' to insert the words 'and so far as respects sums paid for new licences, and the confirming authority.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The next Amendment is, after Clause 6, to insert as a new clause the following—

"Quarter sessions, with respect to their own action and that of the justices of licensing districts under this Act, and the confirming authority, with respect to new licences granted under this Act, shall in each year make such returns to the Secretary of State as the Secretary of State may require."

This is an Amendment which I suggested a few minutes ago and which I said would include the power of the Secretary of State to call for returns not merely with regard to new licences but also old licences. I think the noble Lord, Earl Spencer, is satisfied with this proposal.

EARL SPENCER: I am quite satisfied.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am sure that is so. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, after clause 6, to insert as a new clause the words 'Quarter sessions, with respect to their own action and that of the justices of licensing districts under this Act, and the confirming authority, with respect to new licences granted under this Act, shall in each year make such returns to the Secretary of State as the Secretary of State may require."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN suggested that it would make the point clearer if the noble Marquess would agree to say, in regard to the confirming authority, "and also of the confirming authority." No doubt the noble Marquess would remember a difference of opinion arose on that side with regard to the matter. As he (the Earl of Camperdown) suggested, the proposed new clause would read—

"Quarter sessions, with respect to their own action and that of the justices of licensing districts under this Act, and also of the confirming authority, with respect to new licences granted under this Act, shall in each year make such returns to the Secretary of State as the Secretary of State may require."

His suggestion was that this would make the matter clear.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am afraid we cannot accept the Amendment, as it would rather throw the drafting out of gear.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Perhaps the Government will consider it.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Yes, we will do that.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: On Clause 8 I have a little drafting Amendment which is no more than a printing matter. Your Lordships will see the clause reads on page 6, line 32, as follows "to supply suitable refreshments at reasonable prices, other than intoxicating liquors." It is, of course, intended to read "to supply suitable refreshments other than intoxicating liquors at reasonable prices.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 32, after the word 'refreshment' to insert the words 'other than intoxicating liquor,' and after the word 'prices' to leave out the words 'other than intoxicating liquor.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow, and to be printed as amended. [No. 185.]

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

LORD EMLY: I beg to ask His Majesty's Government the following Questions:—(1) Whether, having regard to the fact that the staff in many Irish national schools of between forty to fifty-nine children is inadequate, when compared with similarly circumstanced schools in England, His Majesty's Government have advised, and, if not, whether they are prepared to advise, the Commissioners of National Education to amend Rule No. 103 of their "Rules and Regulations," which shows the maximum "Staff of Assistants" at present recognised in national schools; (2) How soon the reduction of the average attendance from sixty to fifty children qualifying an assistant teacher in Irish national schools will come into operation; (3) Whether provision will be made for effecting the reduction of the present average attendance of children required for a second assistant teacher. The first two Questions do not, I think, call for any special remarks. As regards the third Question, however, I should like to call your Lordships' attention to page 141 of the Appendix to the 69th Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland for the year 1902. In the General Report on Limerick Circuit, by Mr. Dalton, the senior inspector, we read—

"It is to be remembered, of course, that the erection of a school-house by means of a Government grant is frequently a big undertaking. It sometimes happens that several years have to be spent in wearisome negotiations about sites and titles with landlords, tenants, agents, Courts, trustees, mortgages, *et hoc genus omne.* When, eventually, the case is put into official form, legal obstacles of one kind or another are prone to spring up quite unexpectedly, and to prolong indefinitely the inevitable period of correspondence and inquiry that precedes the final and practical stage of the business. A few months ago I heard a manager congratulate himself on having brought to a successful issue a building application that had been reported on some two or three years before. At different times he was about abandoning the case in despair, so many and intricate were the legal difficulties with which it became entangled; but, by persevering tact and patience, he at last succeeded. Meantime the school children of the remote glens and mountains, for which the school is intended, have had to pass winter after winter in a draughty, dilapidated building that is almost uninhabitable."

I beg to ask the Questions.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): The Answer which I am informed is the proper one to the Questions is this. Rule 103 of the Commissioners' Code provides for the employment of an assistant teacher in schools with an average attendance of sixty pupils. The question of reducing the average so as to enable an assistant to be employed in schools where the average has fallen to fifty has engaged the attention of the Government for some time past. It has been stated by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary in another place that the question was one for consideration in connection with the Development Grant Estimate. A revised Estimate making provision for effecting this reduction will be issued without delay, but obviously the provision cannot operate until the Estimate has been voted by Parliament and the necessary funds placed at the disposal of the Commissioners. With reference to the third Question, it is not proposed to make provision for more than one assistant teacher in schools where the average attendance has fallen from sixty to fifty.

Lord EMLY: Do I understand the noble Lord to say it is not intended to make that provision?

Lord ASHBOURNE: It is not proposed to make such provision.

FEMALE INSPECTOR FOR IRISH WORKHOUSES.

Lord EMLY: I beg to ask His Majesty's Government (*a*) whether, having regard to the enormous number of children, girls, and women in Irish workhouses, His Majesty's Government will appoint a female inspector, whose duty it would be frequently, and without notice, to visit and inspect these children, girls, and women, and to report upon the conditions under which they live; (*b*) whether such female inspectors have been appointed in England or in Scotland.

Lord ASHBOURNE: I am informed that the position of the question is this. There are two female inspectors in the service of the Irish Local Government Board whose duties are concerned with the carrying out of the regulations dealing with the boarding-out of children by boards of guardians. There are three such inspectors on the staff of the English Department, but none, so far as I am aware, in the service of the Scotch Local Government Board. It is open to the Irish Local Government Board to assign other duties to the female inspectors of boarded-out children. The opportunity for considering the matter will more properly arise when the Vice-Regal Commission on Poor Law Reform has furnished its report.

Lord EMLY: There are such inspectors in England?

Lord ASHBOURNE: Yes, the reply I have given suggests that there are three such inspectors on the staff of the English Department.

Lord EMLY: And none in Ireland?

Lord ASHBOURNE: No, but it is competent for the Irish Local Government Board to assign other duties than those at present held by the female inspectors of boarded-out children.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order) Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed.

POST OFFICE BILL.

House in Committee (according to order) Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow.

LEEDS UNIVERSITY BILL.

Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed.

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

[Third Reading].

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved "That the Bill be now read 3^{a},"—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 3, line 36, after the word 'Board' to insert the words 'shall give every assistance in carrying out the provisions of this Act and, where necessary, shall employ their officers to facilitate its execution and.'"—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 7, page 4, line 36, after the word 'Acts' to insert the words 'every case under this Act may be prosecuted in any sheriff Court which the Board may declare by a notice under the hand of the Secretary to the Board to the procurator-fiscal of such sheriff Court to be the Court nearest to the spot where the offence was committed, or otherwise the most convenient for the trial of the case."—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Moved, "That the Bill do now pass."—(*The Earl of Kintore.*)

On Question, Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 8th August, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Rotherham Corporation Bill; Selby Urban District Council Bill; Swindon Corporation Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; De Trafford Estate Bill [Lords]; Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Belfast and North East Ireland Electricity and Power-Gas Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Belfast Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered. An Amendment made. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill; Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 8) Bill, without Amendment.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Loch Leven Water Power Bill; Leyton Urban District Council Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Amendments to — Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; King's College Hospital Bill [Lords]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]; Ilford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure

(Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Ayr Corporation Tramways." [Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th April; *Mr. John Edward Ellis*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 315.]

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (BELFAST).

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the President for 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of fortieth detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births, and Deaths in Ireland, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (GALWAY).

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SECONDARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report for the year 1904 by Sir Henry Craik, K.C.B. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH FOR COUNTIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th May; *Mr. Frederick Wilson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 316.]

SANDGATE HOMES (PAUPER INMATES CHARGEABLE TO METROPOLITAN UNIONS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th June; *Sir Edward Sassoon*]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS).

Copy presented, of Administration Report on the Railways in India for the year 1903, by C. W. Hodson, esquire, M. Inst.C.E., Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, Railways [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE.

Copy presented, of Fiftieth Report of the Postmaster-General [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CUSTOMS.

Copy presented, of Forty-eighth Report of the Commissioners of Customs for the year ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INLAND REVENUE.

Copy presented, of Forty-seventh Report of the Commissioners, for the year ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Copy presented of Seventy-second Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, with Appendices, for the year ending 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd May; *Mr. Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 317.]

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (CONTRACTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th July; *Sir Howard Vincent*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 318.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Return for the year ended 31st March, 1904, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act, to hold Civil Employment of profit under Public Departments [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 319.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3248 and 3249 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (HEALTH).

Copy presented, of Statistical Report of the Health of the Navy for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 320.]

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage and other moneys between the 1st April, 1903, and 31st March, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 321.]

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account presented, of deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof, and the interest thereon, etc., during the financial year 1902-3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 322.]

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

County Courts Act, 1888, and Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879. Copy of Order made by the Lord Chancellor, dated 27th July, 1904, directing that the Registrar of the County Court of Staffordshire, held at West Bromwich shall not practice as a solicitor, and that Section 20 of The Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Act, 1879, shall not apply to the office of Registrar of the said County Court [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway.

Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the barony of Kilmaine, county Mayo, has given a perpetual guarantee of six pence in the pound to the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway; if so, will he say whether the Ballinrobe District Council, within which the barony is situated, is empowered to elect three directors to act on the board of management; and, if not, with whom does the right of election or nomination rest.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) No, Sir. The guarantee of the barony of Kilmaine and part of the barony of Carra, under the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway Order, 1890, is a maximum of 5 per cent. per annum on the paid up capital of the company; but the baronies are recouped by the Treasury to the extent of one-half of the amounts paid under the guarantee, not exceeding a sum equal to interest at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum. The balance of profit over the working expenses is credited to the undertaking before the guarantee is calculated. The Order above referred to provides that the barony of Kilmaine may, by resolution at presentment sessions, elect three directors on the board, which is to consist of not more than seven directors. It appears that there are only four ordinary directors on the board at present. The business of presentment sessions was transferred by the Local Government Act of 1898 to rural district councils. It is open to the councils of the districts in which this guaranteeing area is situated to make application to the Local Government Board for an Order providing for the representation of the guaranteeing area on the board of management of the railway.

Foreign Seamen on British Ships—Numbers engaged at Shields, Cardiff, and Antwerp.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state how many sailors and firemen were engaged at the ports of North and South Shields from Monday, 18th July, until Saturday, 23rd July, inclusive; and the number of British nationality and the number of foreigners.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state how many sailors and firemen were engaged on British ships at the port of Cardiff from Monday, 18th July, until Saturday, 23rd July, inclusive; and how many were British and how many were foreigners.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) In the period stated 194 sailors and firemen were engaged at South Shields; of these

130 were of British and sixty-four of foreign nationality. At North Shields fifty-three sailors and firemen were engaged during the same period; of these forty-three were of British and ten of foreign nationality. The engagements at Cardiff with regard to which my hon. and gallant friend also inquires were as follows in the period named:—337 sailors and firemen, of these 170 were of British and 167 of foreign nationality.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state how many sailors and firemen were engaged on British ships at the Port of Antwerp (Belgium) from the 5th to 11th June, inclusive; how many of these were British and how many were foreigners; and whether the foreign seamen were all able to produce certificates of discharge.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) In the period stated, ten British vessels opened agreements and engaged crews at Antwerp. For these, 129 sailors and firemen were engaged; fourteen British and 115 of foreign nationality; ninety-seven of the latter produced continuous certificates of discharge. Four other British vessels during the period named engaged twenty-three sailors and firemen at Antwerp. Of these, two were British and the remainder foreign. As they did not open fresh agreements when engaging these sailors and firemen, I have no records from which I can say how many produced continuous discharge books.

Prices of and Duty on Wheat in United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Italy.

Dr. SHIPMAN (Northampton): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what were the average prices of wheat per imperial quarter in the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Italy, respectively, at the end of July, 1904; what were the duties on imported wheat per imperial quarter in each of these countries at that time; what were the approximate percentages of imported wheat in the total wheat supply of each of these countries; and whether the average prices include both the imported and the home-grown wheat.

Countries.	Duty on imported wheat per quarter.	Average price of wheat per quarter.	Basis and date of price.	Approximate percentage of imported wheat in total supply (five years 1899. 1903.
	s. d.	s. d.		
United Kingdom	Nil	28 0 29 0	Gazette average price of English wheat (last week in July) Average declared value of imported wheat (July)	77½
Germany - -	7 7	37 9	Berlin official market price 29th July	34
France - -	12 2¾	36 6	Paris official price 30th July	2*
Italy - - -	13 0½	(Cannot yet be given for the end of July)		18

* Average of four years 1899-1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The official sources from which the above foreign prices are taken do not state whether imported wheat is included or not.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders Granted to Local Authorities and Others.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state how many Provisional Orders for electric lighting have been granted to local authorities and to others, respectively, during the five years ending 31st December, 1903; what was the average length of time granted by the Board of Trade for completion of the works; under how many of these Orders have works been begun; what is the nominal capital of the Companies or others applying for these Orders; in how many of the Orders under which work has begun are the works being carried out by those to whom the original Order was granted; and is a clause generally inserted in the Provisional Order requiring an applicant to satisfy the Board of Trade within any stipulated time that substantial progress has been made.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The number of electric lighting Provisional Orders granted during the period named was 268 to local authorities, and 132 to companies and others. In nearly every case the length of time prescribed for the completion of the works in the streets specially named in the Order is two years. The Board of Trade have not the necessary information to enable them to state the number of Orders under which works have been begun or the nominal capital of the companies or others applying for the Orders. Powers have been transferred by the grantees to other bodies in thirty-five cases under special powers contained in the Orders. The Answer to the last inquiry is in the negative, but applicants (other than local authorities) are required within six months from the commencement of the Order to deposit or secure a specified sum as security for the execution of works and to show to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade that they are in a position fully and efficiently to discharge the duties and obligations imposed upon them by their Order throughout the area of supply.

Yorkshire (West Riding) Education Committee—Deduction from Teachers Salary for Time spent in giving Denominational Instruction.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the fact that the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire have resolved that a deduction shall be made from the salary of any teacher in a non-provided school in respect of the time given to denominational religious teaching; whether, seeing that such teacher is bound by the Act of 1902 satisfactorily to give such religious teaching, he can suggest any means of relieving teachers in non-provided schools in the West Riding County Council area from the position in which they now find themselves placed.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board are aware that the County Council of the West Riding have passed a resolution to the effect described in the Question, and also that the council is now conducting an inquiry into the amount of time given in each school to religious teaching of a denominational character. I am not aware that any teacher's salary has yet been diminished, or that any action has as yet been taken by the county council. The teachers do not, therefore as yet appear to be in a position which demands the consideration of the Board.

Religious Instruction in New Provided Schools—Right of Parents to nominate Instructor.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the Board of Education has made Orders under The Education Act, 1902, in respect of the management of many new provided schools whereby it is provided that if the principal officiating minister of the parish shall refuse to act or is absent from all meetings of the managers during a period of six months an archdeacon or the Bishop of the diocese within which the school is situated may from time to time appoint some person to act as his substitute; and, if so, whether he can see his way to vary these so as to give to the parents of the children attending these schools or to the county council the right of appointing such substitutes.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The provision referred to occurs in Orders which direct that the principal officiating minister of the parish shall be an *ex officio* foundation manager. The Board consider that in cases where the circumstances justify such a direction the provision in question is appropriate and reasonable, and, unless special reason is shown in any particular case for a departure from their usual practice, the Board are not prepared to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member.

Compensation for Injury — Case of William Welsford, Shipwright, of Devonport Dockyard.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state for what reason is William Welsford, established shipwright, Devonport, denied the injury compensation of twenty-four-sixtieths of his average weekly earnings, being the amount guaranteed by the Admiralty, under their contracting-out agreement, seeing that his capacity to contribute towards his own support has been totally destroyed, and that the incapacitating injury occurred more than a year since.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The award in Welsford's case was based on the report of the Fleet surgeon in November, 1903, that his capacity to contribute to his own support was not totally destroyed, but was materially impaired. Since then, in March, 1904, a further report has been received stating that Welsford cannot now do anything to support himself. The award will be reviewed in November next, when, if there is no improvement, it will be increased to twenty-four-sixtieths. In cases of injury to the head resulting in brain mischief it is always for some time doubtful whether the effects are permanent or to some extent temporary.

Kent Waterworks Pumping Station at Darenth—Inquiry into Purity of Water.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Kent Waterworks Company, before giving up the control of their new pumping station at Darenth, Kent, informed him that an experimental inquiry would serve to show whether and to what extent the water raised from the well may be derived from the adjacent land; and, if so, will he say when he will cause such inquiry to be made in order to ascertain whether water so derived is liable to pollution by surface drainage.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The experiment referred to was suggested by an adjoining owner with a view of showing that the well was liable to pollution by surface drainage from his land. The company, however, stated that they were advised that the experiment would only serve to show whether, and to what extent, water raised from the well may be derived from the adjacent land, and would not form any proof of the possibility of deleterious matter passing from such land into the well. As my hon. friend is aware, the undertaking of the company has now been transferred to the Metropolitan Water Board, and I am in communication with that Board on the subject of the complaint addressed to me. I have not at present decided to direct an experimental inquiry to be made.

Telephone Trunk Calls between 8 p.m. Saturday and 8 a.m. on Monday.

MR. BROTHERTON (Wakefield): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will grant six minute telephone trunk calls from 8 p.m. on Saturdays till 8 a.m. on Mondays.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The change suggested by the hon. Member would involve an increase of staff for Sunday duty at most of the larger trunk wire exchanges, and I am unwilling to take any steps which would tend to increase unnecessarily the amount of Sunday duty. The use of the trunk system is available on Sunday at any hour to meet cases of emergency.

Protection of Salmon and Sea Trout—Action of the Fishmongers' Company.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to a public notice issued and posted in the Firth of Clyde District of Argyllshire by the Company of Fishmongers, London, threatening to search boats and exact penalties against persons in possession of salmon or sea trout; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) My attention has not been called to the matter referred to by the hon. Member, but on inquiry I learn that notices have been posted up on the west coast by the Fishmongers' Company, pointing out that power is given to officers appointed under the Acts and to police officers to search boats suspected to contain salmon or sea trout illegally taken. The administration of these Acts is primarily in the hands of district boards and officers appointed by them, but for certain offences under the Acts other persons have authority to proceed. No action seems called for.

Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the amount of capital expenditure involved during the current year under the Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill, and what are the items that go to make up this total; what is the total amount of capital already borrowed by means of terminable annuities, under the enabling Acts, during the last ten years, giving the totals of each year.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The capital expenditure during the current financial year under the Acts to which the provisions of the Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill apply, is estimated at £9,233,000, namely:—

Under the Naval Works Acts	£4,500,000
Under the Military Works Acts - - - - - -	3,500,000
Under the Telegraph Acts -	750,000
Under the Uganda Railway Acts - - - - - -	219,000
Under the Land Registry (New Buildings) Act - -	17,000
Under the Public Buildings (Expenses) Act, 1903 - -	197,000
Under the Public Offices Site (Dublin) Act - - -	50,000
	£9,233,000

Of this amount it is estimated that about £6,000,000 will be raised by Exchequer bonds under the provisions of the Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill. The amount of capital borrowed in previous years under these and similar Acts is shown in detail at pages 10–13 of Command Paper No. 2065. The totals for the last ten years are—

1894–5 - -	£ 760,000
1895–6 - -	1,088,550
1896–7 - -	694,114
1897–8 - -	—
1898–9 - -	3,932,336
1899–1900 - -	2,985,617
1900–1 - -	4,914,587
1901–2 - -	6,284,100
1902–3 - -	8,140,400
1903–4 - -	5,305,000
	£34,104,704

In the same period debt amounting to £4,732,195 has been redeemed by the terminable annuities, so that the net addition to "Other Capital Liabilities" in the ten years was £29,372,509.

Publication of Departmental History of Lord Curzon's Administration of India.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether any arrangements can be made under which the departmental history of Lord Curzon's administration of India, now in course of compilation, will be made public.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have no information on the subject to which the Question refers.

Cutting of Turf by Tenants from Bog at Carnagh, Parish of St. John's, Athlone.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board have purchased a bog in the electoral division of Carnagh, parish of St. John's, and union of Athlone, with a view to letting the use of it to others than the tenants who have been in the enjoyment of it for the last quarter of a century;

and that the Board has taken proceedings in Chancery to restrain the old tenants of the bog referred to from any longer using it; and, if so, whether, seeing that those tenants have no other source from which to obtain fuel for their households, he will direct the Board to discontinue those legal proceedings and allow the old tenants to cut turf as usual on the bog in question.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The bog was acquired by the Board last year. For a year previously it was not used by the tenants, and before the Board arranged to dispose of the turbary the former conacre tenants committed trespass, and cut turf in spite of the warnings given by the Board's bailiff. The Board has instituted proceedings with a view to asserting its right to the title. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

Londonderry Prison Officials.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why the hospital warder at His Majesty's Prison, Londonderry, is, contrary to the arrangement prevailing in other Irish prisons, exempt from night duty and allowed to sleep out of the hospital; and why this official is allowed to act as chief warder; also why the gate warder at this prison has been allowed to retain that post after being convicted of drunkenness in 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The arrangement under which the hospital warder at Derry Prison is exempt from night duty is in accordance with the arrangement existing in all prisons except small ones. Being a married man and unprovided with quarters for his family in prison he is allowed to sleep out. He acts as chief warder in the absence of the latter because he is next in seniority. The gate warder was fined for drunkenness in 1901. Save for this offence his conduct has been reported to be excellent. It is not proposed to remove him from the post.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that during the last two years five Protestant officials have been removed from His Majesty's Prison, Londonderry, and their places filled by Roman Catholics; whether Presbyterian prisoners, when attending Divine service, are placed in charge of a warder of another denomination because there is no Presbyterian official in the prison; and, if so, whether he will take steps to remedy this state of things.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) At every prison it is necessary to have one or two Protestant and Catholic warders for Divine service duty. But, subject to this, transfers and promotions of officers are regulated solely by considerations of fitness and efficiency and not of religion. It is true that Protestant Episcopalian officers in Derry and elsewhere are on duty with Presbyterian prisoners at Divine service; but this arises from the fact that warders of the latter denomination are few in number and are not available in such prisons. I will inquire whether it is practicable to send a Presbyterian warder to Derry Prison for this duty.

Promotion or Irish National School Teachers.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if, in view of the fact that the condition for the promotion of a principal teacher to second division of first grade for the triennial period ended 1903 is that at least two of the last three annual reports on his school be marked very good or excellent, he will say how many were promoted to this grade who had not at least two reports marked very good or excellent during the same period; and why the award very good is made to cover a period when it was not set down as a printed instruction to inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) During the triennial period ended 1903 the majority of the forms of annual report provided for the terms "very good" and "excellent" to indicate the progress made and the proficiency of the pupils; and it was made one of the conditions for the promotion of a principal teacher to the second division of the first grade that at least two of the last three annual reports on his school be marked "excellent" or at least "very good." In some of the forms of annual report, however, used by inspectors the term "very good" as applied to the progress of the school was not provided for. But, as explained on the 4th instant,† the case of any teacher whose promotion to this grade might be adversely affected thereby was specially examined with the view of ascertaining whether such teacher merited promotion. Two principal teachers were promoted to the second division of the first grade who had not at least two reports marked "very good" or "excellent."

Cost per Head of Volunteer Force—Items on which Reduction is to be Effected.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can supply the House with the items *per capita* under which the cost of the British Volunteer is estimated at £7 per annum, and name those under which it is proposed under his scheme to effect a reduction of £2 per head.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The £7 consists of, *per capita*, the following items:—

	£
(1) Pay of adjutants and sergeant instructors - - - -	1·34
(2) Capitation and other grants -	2·60
(3) Camp grants - - - -	1·23
(4) Stores, etc., including rifles and ammunition - - -	1·22
(5) Non-effective charges—(pensions)	·61
	7·00

If the proposed reduction is made it will be best effected under heads 2 and 3.

Allotment of South African War Trophies.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state to what public bodies trophies of the late war have been allotted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) In accordance with the recommendations of the Trophy Committee, the guns captured in the late war have been allotted to districts, and have been distributed by the General Officers Commanding as follows: the towns being in most cases either district or divisional headquarters:—

Great Britain and Ireland.

1st Army Corps Area -	Aldershot.
2nd Army Corps Area -	Tidworth. Dover. Devonport.
3rd Army Corps Area -	Dublin. Cork. Belfast.
4th Army Corps Area -	Colchester. Rochester. Guildford.
Not inlcuded in Army Corps Area - -	York. Chester. Manchester. Edinburgh. Glasgow. Perth.

I have no further information to show to what public bodies the trophies have been allotted. These are in addition to those allotted to the Colonies and India, which are being dealt with by the Colonial and India Offices respectively, and to those presented to certain units in recognition of specific acts of gallantry. Jersey and Guernsey have also each received a captured gun. A certain number of captured rifles have also been allotted to public bodies at home, to the Colonies and India, and to regimental messes.

Cost per Head of British Soldiers Abroad.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): To ask the Secretary of State for War why the annual cost of each British soldier in South Africa is £144 a year, when the cost at Esquimalt is only £122, and at Halifax, Nova Scotia, £115.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The reasons for the higher cost in South Africa are:—

(a) In South Africa a considerable portion of the force consists of mounted troops, who are more expensive.

---

† See page 970.

(b) There is also maintained in South Africa a large number of transport animals, necessitating the employment of a numerous civilian establishment, whose cost is included in the figures given for the South African garrison.

(c) The prices of provisions, forage, etc., are higher in South Africa than in Canada.

Preservation of Wild Animals and Birds in Lagos.

Sir HENRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware of the extent to which the slaughter of wild animals and birds is now being carried on by the natives in the Colony of Lagos; if he will cause inquiry to be made as to the causes thereof; whether he will ascertain if the Governor of the Colony of Lagos has taken any, and what, steps to prohibit such slaughter, as he is empowered to do under the provisions of the International Convention for the Preservation of Wild Animals and Birds in Africa signed in London on 19th May, 1900; and, in particular, whether the sale of cheap trade guns and powder to the natives can be regulated or prohibited.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) An Ordinance was enacted in Lagos in 1900 whereby the Governor of the Colony was empowered to put into force the provisions of the Convention of the 19th of May, 1900, and regulations for the preservation of certain wild animals and birds have been drawn up. Inquiry will be made as to the promulgation of these regulations. Considerable difficulties attend the imposition of restrictions in the Protectorate of Lagos as distinguished from the colony, but I will communicate with the Governor with the object of securing the end which my hon. friend has at heart. The entry of flint-lock guns and powder is subject to a certain amount of control, as duties are payable on the importation of these articles. It is feared that without an international agreement on the subject it would not be possible to prevent their introduction into the territories. Failing such an agreement, any further increase of the duties would encourage smuggling on a large scale, which the Government of Lagos would have the greatest difficulty in repressing.

Port of London Bill.

General LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of inability on account of time to pass the Port of London Bill during the present session, he proposes to ask the House to arrange for carrying it over in its present position to the next session of Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I must refer my hon. and gallant friend to the statement I made on this subject to-day.

Protection of Trade Union Funds—Suggested Legislation.

Mr. BELL (Derby): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will introduce a Bill to protect trade union funds in the next session of Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I fear it is quite impossible for me to make any further statement as to the programme for next session.

Royal Commission on Trades Disputes.

Mr. BELL: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state the date on which the Royal Commission on Trades Disputes was appointed; and when they are likely to report.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Royal Commissioners are still engaged in taking evidence, and, I understand, they are not yet in a position to fix a date for the presentation of their Report.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Rearmament of the Artillery.

* Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Government adhere to the promises with regard to the re-armament of the artillery with quick-firing guns, made in the Memorandum of the Secretary of State prefixed to the Army Estimates of the present year; and whether orders have

yet been given for proceeding with the manufacture of the gun, in addition to the orders for India, the cost of which falls upon the Indian Exchequer.

* The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): I prefer not to give any pledge with regard to the programme next year until I submit the Estimates to the House. Arrangements are now being made for placing nine batteries of Horse Artillery and six batteries of Field Artillery with the trade, in addition to the orders for India. Orders to the Government Factories will be given later.

* Sir CHARLES DILKE: But why so small an order after your promises?

* Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I consider it a large order.

* Sir CHARLES DILKE: What, six batteries?

* Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is in addition to the Indian order. When I made my statement I said it was only intended to order in this current year the batteries for India. I think the right hon. Gentleman must have in mind my promises for next year.

Porthcawl Rifle Range.

Mr. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the proposed rifle range at Porthcawl, in Glamorganshire, has been completed; and, if so, if he will state what expenditure has been incurred in completing the range.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Porthcawl rifle range will be ready for use to-day. The expenditure incurred to date mounts to £1,428.

Summer Headgear for Soldiers.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state when it is proposed to issue for the use of the troops the light cool headgear in charge of the Army Ordnance Department; and say why it was not issued some weeks ago.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. and gallant Member's Question is not understood. All troops are in possession of summer headgear, either cap covers, helmets, or sun-hats. No stock in the possession of the Army Ordnance Department has been held back. Issues have been made as demands have been received with the exception of about 800 cap covers of special sizes which are now under supply.

South African Campaign—Honorary Army Rank for Officers of the Auxiliary Forces.

Sir LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer officers, respectively, served in South Africa, and for how many, respectively, was the grant of honorary Army rank approved; and whether he will reconsider a relaxation of the rule which makes six months service in South Africa the minimum qualifying service for the grant.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The information required by the first part of the Question is not available at the War Office and can only be obtained by a very laborious process. I hope, therefore, my hon. friend will not press for it. As regards the last part of the Question the reply is in the negative.

South African Shipping Freights Conference.

Sir LEES KNOWLES: On behalf of the hon. Member for Bedford, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies at what date the proposed Conference at Johannesburg between representatives of the South African Colonies with regard to shipping freights will be held; and what will be the terms of reference and method of procedure.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): The conference will meet about the 22nd instant. The terms of reference and the method of procedure have, I understand, not been finally settled, but Lord Milner informs me that the object of the conference will be to inquire into the charges now obtaining for ocean freights to South Africa and the disposal of shipping orders by the various Governments, and to endeavour to arrive at some means of securing advantages equal to those enjoyed by the Governments for the general public, and that the delegates will be invited to present a report and recommendations. Every opportunity of being heard will be given to parties interested. As the conference commences about the 22nd instant it is desirable that persons wishing to give evidence should attend as soon as possible after that date. But the proceedings will be prolonged, and no doubt English witnesses leaving 14th August or even 21st August would be in time.

Indian Government Departments—Distribution of Work and Salaries.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the recent creation of a commercial and industrial department for administrative purposes in India and the redistribution of work which the creation of this department involves, will he consider the expediency of laying upon the Table of the House a Return showing briefly the character of the work dealt with by the various Government departments in India and the amount paid in salaries for each department.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): It is not the case that a separate commercial and industrial department has just been created, though it is proposed to create one under the present Bill. The various departments of the Government of India, and the amount paid in salaries in each department, will be found stated on page 83 of the Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1902-3, which were laid on the Table of this House in May last.

Anglo-French Convention—Germany and the Egyptain Clauses.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will lay upon the Table of the House the recent treaty concluded by this country with Germany in relation to the Egyptian clauses of the Anglo-French Agreement, and will he state whether there are any secret clauses attached to such Anglo-German treaty.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): No treaty has been concluded with Germany on the subject, but Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy have not only, like Russia, assented to the Khedivial Decree, but have also undertaken not to obstruct the action of Great Britain in Egypt by asking that a limit of time be fixed for the British occupation or in any other manner; and agreed that the execution of the last sentence of Paragraph 1, as well as of Paragraph 2, of Article VIII. of the Treaty of the 29th October, 1888, shall remain in abeyance. On the other hand, His Majesty's Government have given an assurance to these Powers that they guarantee to their commerce in Egypt most-favoured-nation treatment for thirty years. That they will respect the rights which, in virtue of treaties, conventions, and usage, they enjoy in Egypt. That their schools in Egypt shall continue to enjoy the same liberty as in the past, and that officials of those nationalities now in the Egyptian service shall not be placed under conditions less advantageous than those applying to the British officials in the same service. The Answer to the last paragraph is in the negative.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Has Turkey, as one of the signatories to the Convention of 1888, been consulted in this matter?

EARL PERCY was understood to reply in the negative.

Crime in Egypt.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the growth of crime in Egypt, as shown in Lord Cromer's Annual Report, will he consider the expediency of recommending an inquiry on the subject.

EARL PERCY: No, Sir. His Majesty's Government see no reason to interfere with the discretion of the Egyptian Government in such matters.

Egypt and the Anglo-French Agreement.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, before the final ratification of the Anglo-French agreement by His

Britannic Majesty's Government, an opportunity will be afforded to the Egyptian people of expressing, through their chosen representatives on the Legislative Council and General Assembly, an opinion upon those of its provisions which relate to Egypt.

Earl PERCY: If the hon. Member will refer to Articles 23 and 37 of the Organic Law Egypt No. 19 (1883) he will see that questions of the kind referred to do not fall within the purview of either the Legislative Council or the General Assembly.

American Tariff on Pickled Fish.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the New Ross Urban Council, at a recent meeting, passed a resolution deprecating the increased tax on pickled fish by the United States Government; and whether, as this tax strikes at an Irish industry, the Government will enter into negotiations with the United States Government with a view to lessen or abolish altogether this tax on Irish fish.

Earl PERCY: The hon. Member is no doubt referring to the recent practice of levying the tax at a rate calculated on the brine as well as on the fish. By a recent decision of the United States Treasury it has been laid down that the weight of the brine in which salt or pickled fish in barrels is immersed is not part of the dutiable weight of the fish and the tax is accordingly no longer so levied.

The Post Office and the National Telephone Company.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is still negotiating with the National Telephone Company for the purchase of their undertaking; and, if so, when will Members of this House be informed of the proposed terms; and whether the London telephone area will be treated separately.

Th POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I am still in negotiation with the National Telephone Company, and the hon. Member will recognise that while the negotiations are still in progress it is undesirable to make any statement as to the nature or terms of the arrangement under discussion. Having regard to the date which we have reached I shall certainly not be in a position to make any communication to the House on this subject before the end of the present session; but if an agreement is arrived at, it shall, as I have already promised, be laid before Parliament before it becomes binding, in order that the House may have an opportunity of considering it.

Illegible Postmarks.

Mr. SKEWES-COX (Surrey, Kingston): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will give such directions as will ensure that letters and parcels are so stamped that the date and hour of posting may be legibly and distinctly marked on them by the officials of the post office.

Lord STANLEY: As I stated on the 3rd instant in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Canterbury, † attention has frequently been called to the necessity for making clear postmarks on letters. At the same time it should be borne in mind that postmarking is generally done under conditions of great pressure, and the public would not, I am sure, willingly submit to any curtailment of facilities in order that additional time might be given to making clearer impressions. In many cases, too, the bulky and uneven nature of the contents of letters and parcels makes a clear impression difficult. I am again calling the attention of the staff to the subject.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that numerous conscientious objectors to vaccination in various parts of the country have recently been refused certificates of exemption; and will he state what steps he proposes to take to enable such objectors to vaccination to obtain certificates.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): Representations on this matter reach me from time to time, but I am not aware of any special development of it recently. I have no authority over the exercise of the discretion of the magistrates; but I may perhaps draw attention to the fact that the Lord Chief Justice in addressing the Grand Jury at Birmingham on the 27th ultimo discussed the principles on which the Act ought to be administered, and I hope that his comments will be generally studied and will do much to remove misapprehensions, and to secure a more uniform administration of the law.

---

† See page 711.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman bring under the notice of the justices the observations of the Lord Chief Justice?

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I am quite ready to do so in due course.

Metropolitan Hackney Carriages—Police Examination.

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it has been brought to his notice that the metropolitan police authorities, in the examination of hackney carriages, after the vehicles have been inspected and passed for the year, have damaged the vehicles; and, if so, whether he will issue instructions to put a stop to this practice.

***Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS**: The Commissioner of Police informs me that only necessary tests are applied to the vehicles and in such a manner as not to injure them, but that a specific complaint has been received from a proprietor which is now being investigated.

Life-Saving Gear on Passenger Ships to and from the Continent.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if, having regard to the risk run by those crossing the Channel to and from Hamburg, Rotterdam, Antwerp, Ostend, Calais, Dieppe, Havre, Bordeaux, and other Continental ports in foreign built and manned passenger ships, unprovided with the life-saving gear and life-belts for every person licensed to be carried, as required by the Merchant Shipping (Life Saving Appliances) Act of 1888, he will take steps to assimilate British law to that in force in the United States, and require all ships trading to or from a British port to comply with British laws framed for the safety of passengers.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The question of requiring foreign ships trading to or from a British port to comply with British laws framed for the safety of passengers is being considered by a Select Committee, presided over by my hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. The Committee has suggested its re-appointment next session.

Caledonian and North British Railway—Workmen's Trains.

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will use his influence with the Caledonian and North British Railway Companies to induce them to furnish ordinary third class carriages on the workmen's trains running from Glasgow to Rutherglen and Clyde Bank, and Glasgow to Kilbowie Road, instead of the present accommodation consisting of worn-out carriages in many instances without windows and with defective lighting.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: No previous complaint has been made to me with regard to the carriages used on the trains referred to. The hon. Member is probably aware that the Board of Trade have no powers to deal with the matter, but I will call the attention of the railway companies concerned to the complaint.

Fenit Harbour Board.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received a resolution, passed unanimously at a recent meeting of the Kerry County Council, demanding a public inquiry into the constitution and conduct of the Fenit Harbour Board; and whether, in the view of the local feeling on this matter, steps will be taken to have this inquiry held immediately.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I have not received the resolution referred to. The

Board of Trade have no power to order such an inquiry as that desired.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N): Have not the Board power to make inquiry into facts such as these. There are five baronies which contribute £5,000 a year and have no representation on the Board.

Exports of Smokeless Steam Coal to Russia and Japan.

SIR LEES KNOWLES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the quantity of smokeless steam coal exported from Great Britain to Russia and Japan respectively, during each of the months of this year; and if Russia is placing indirectly orders for such coal for ports yet to be advised.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Smokeless steam coal is not separately distinguished in the Export Returns. The quantities of steam coal exported from the United Kingdom to Russia during each month of this year have been:—In January, 31,000 tons; February, 14,000 tons; March, 28,000 tons; April, 126,000 tons; May, 394,000 tons; June, 405,000 tons; July, 383,000 tons; a total of 1,381,000 tons. The figures as to exports to Japan are—January, 22,000 tons; February, 39,000 tons; March, 6,000 tons; April, 4,000 tons; May and June, nil, July, 16,000 tons—a total of 87,000 tons. In addition about 1,800 tons of anthracite have been exported to Russia during the seven months. I have no information as to the last part of the hon. Member's Question.

Treatment of London Pauper Consumptives.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, having regard to the request of the various boards of guardians in the Metropolis that a central authority should take over the treatment of poor consumptives at present chargeable to the poor rates, he will issue an Order to the Metropolitan Asylums Board to undertake the care of these consumptive patients.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I have received representations from some metropolitan boards of guardians in favour of this proposal, and I have communicated with the Metropolitan Asylums Board on the subject. They realise not only its magnitude and importance but also the extension of their duties and responsibilities, and the large increase in their expenditure which it would involve, and they wish for some expression of opinion from my Department before proceeding further. I share their views as to the far-reaching character of the proposal. It is one which requires very careful consideration, and I am not at present in a position to express a definite opinion with regard to it. It will, however, continue to receive my attention.

Cooscroum Boat Slip.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the resolution passed by the Kerry County Council on the 28th July, with reference to the slip at Cooscroum, in which the inaction of the Congested Districts Board was complained of; and whether, in preparing the estimate of expenditure for the next financial year, the Board will carry out the improvements required at this fishing station.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The application for further expenditure at this place will be considered in February next. In the meantime the Board cannot give any undertaking that the works proposed will be carried out.

Marlborough Street Training College, Dublin.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state for what number of students is provision to be made in the Marlborough Street Training College in connection with the proposed building and equipment grant of £50,000; what is the capitation payment taken as the basis of the grant proposed to be made; are the existing buildings in Marlborough Street and in Talbot Street to be used under the new arrangement; if so, are the new buildings to be erected merely houses of residence and not a complete college.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The new buildings will provide accommodation for 130 male and 165 female students, the numbers for which the existing college is licensed. The capitation payments will continue at the present fixed rates which are set out in the Estimates. The existing buildings in Marlborough Street will continue to be used as lecture rooms. The new buildings are required as residential establishments. The house in Talbot Street will cease to be occupied as a place of residence.

Police-Constable Robinson of Letterfrack.

Mr. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of Constable Edward Robinson, now stationed at Letterfrack, Connemara, who married when he was only two-and-a-half years in the Royal Irish Constabulary, against constabulary regulations; whether he is aware that on the 30th May last, his wife reported him to the county inspector at Galway for neglecting to support her; that, on this constable's conduct being brought under the notice of the Inspector-General, he was merely reprimanded and removed to another district in the same county; whether an inquiry will be instituted with the view of compelling Constable Robinson to maintain his wife, having regard to the fact that the extreme penalty of dismissal has not been carried out in his case; and whether he will state why exceptional lenient punishment has been meted out to Robinson for this breach of the regulations.

Mr. WYNDHAM: On the 30th May the wife of Constable Robinson wrote to the county inspector of Galway complaining that he would not apply to the authorities for leave to marry, although he had over ten years of service, but she made no complaint that the constable had neglected to support her. The constable at once admitted the fact that he had married without leave in 1896. Having regard to the excellence of his character for a number of years as testified to by his officers the Inspector-General refrained from recommending his discharge and dealt with his offence by giving him an unfavourable record and ordering his transfer. I am making inquiry into the statement in the Question that the constable has neglected to support his wife.

St. Luke's National School, Cork—Examination in Irish.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at the annual examination in St. Luke's National School, Cork, in the year 1902–3, the inspector refused to examine in Irish, and that the special examination which he promised did not take place; and whether he will explain why Mr. Coyne, in examining in Irish in same school eighteen months later, ordered the teacher out of the school.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am informed that Irish is not taught in any National School in Cork known as St. Luke's, and that the Commissioners are unable to identify the particular school referred to. If the hon. Member will communicate to me the name of the teacher, further inquiry will be made.

Marshall Estate, Kerry.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the case of the Marshall Estate, Cellinaferey, Kerry, which is being sold, steps have been taken to have the evicted tenants reinstated.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Any application made by the evicted tenants will be considered. So far, the estate has not been brought before the Commissioners to be dealt with.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether under the Land Act of last year any evicted tenants have been reinstated?

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. FLAVIN: It is a very material fact, however.

Irish National Foresters Demonstration at Cookstown

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, 31st ultimo, a demonstration of Irish National Foresters was held in Cookstown, that a crowd following the procession used Party expressions, threw stones, and made an unsuccessful attempt to pull down the Union Jack, and that on the return journey of the procession disorderly conduct was carried on, revolver shots were fired, and several persons were assaulted; and, if so, will he say what action, if any, was taken in the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the Foresters demonstration was orderly and well-conducted and that the persons who created the disturbances complained of were unconnected with that society and were strangers who marched through an Orange quarter. The police acted promptly and with vigour, and it was due to their action that a serious breach of the peace was prevented. Four persons were assaulted, three of them very slightly. No clue to the assailants has so far been obtained, but the police are pursuing their inquiries.

Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction—Literature for Village Libraries.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction have circulated a work on political economy, by C. S. Devas, S.I., in which Roman Catholic doctrines are supported; and, if so, will he say if its circulation is made at the public expense; and if the Department has placed another work on economics on its library aid list; is he further aware that a manual on Christian Art in Ireland, in which the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are expounded, is on the same list; and, if so, will he say what action, if any, he proposes taking in the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM; The Department has issued a list of publications from which selections, not exceeding £3 in value, are made by the committees of approved village libraries. The cost is defrayed by the Department. It is not aware that sectarian views are advocated in the work on political economy by Mr. Devas—the only work on economics on the list. The manual on Early Christian Art was written by Miss Stokes, who, I believe, was a Protestant.

Rowe Estate, County Wexford.

Mr. FFRENCH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Irelnd whether he is aware that negotiations have been going on for a long time regarding the sale of the Rowe Estate, county Wexford; that, after an agreement was arrived at between landlord and tenant, the landlord demanded another year's purchase for the sporting rights; if so, can he say whether this has blocked the sale of the estate; and, if not, can he state why the estate is not sold.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This estate is in the Land Judge's Court. On the 4th July the Land Judge approved of a sale on terms which were subsequently accepted by the tenants. No order was made with respect to sporting rights, and when, on the 27th July, the owner asked the Land Judge to place a value on them, he declined and suggested they should be vested in the Land Commission. The solicitor having carriage was authorised, at the same time, to apply to the Estates Commissioners for a request under Section 7 of the Act of 1903, in the event of the tenants agreeing to the sporting rights being so vested. The tenants, with a few exceptions, have agreed, and the application for a request will be made forthwith.

Roscommon and Leitrim County Court Judgeship.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Irish Government, with the view of increasing the Development Grant Fund, to effect a saving by amalgamation, in connection with the vacancy now existing in the County Court Judgeship of Roscommon and Leitrim.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The question of providing for the discharge of the duties of the vacant office is under consideration. I am unable, at present, to make any further announcement in the matter.

Dillon Estate, Ballaghaderreen.

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have received a memorial from 100 sub-tenants on the Dillon Estate, in the town of Ballaghaderreen, praying to be made the owners of their holdings; have the Board entered into any agreements with the middlemen for purchase in these cases; and whether, in view of Mr. Justice Meredith's recent decision, the Board will take steps to extinguish the interests of the middlemen and sell direct to the persons in occupation of the holdings.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Many of the sub-tenants are sub-tenants to the wife of Dr. Dillon, who has expressed her willingness to sell to the Congested Districts Board, but her solicitor has not yet furnished to the Board the rental of the property. The other sub-tenants who petitioned hold houses in the town of Ballaghaderreen from residents and others. The ground rents of these houses belong to the Congested Districts Board. In all these cases the Board has offered to sell the ground rents at a most reasonable figure, but many of the houses are very old and dilapidated, and would not afford an adequate security for the purchase money necessary to be advanced.

Irish Local Government Board Surcharges.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board can state, from the Minutes of Proceedings in their possession, the total amounts surcharged by their auditors on members of county councils, rural district councils, and Poor Law boards during the six months ended the 31st March last; the proportion of that total remitted by the Board on appeal; and the proportion levied off the parties surcharged.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The total amount of the surcharges in the period stated was about £770, of which 64 per cent. was remitted or discharged, and about 34 per cent. levied off the parties. In the remaining cases appeals are under consideration.

Cookstown Disturbances—Father M'Brien's Complaint.

Mr. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Rev. Father M'Brien, Washing Bay, and a party of friends, were insulted and threatened by an Orange crowd when driving to Cookstown on Sunday last; that, notwithstanding the fact that this circumstance was duly reported to the police, no notice was taken of it, with the result that on their return journey Father M'Brien and his friends were hooted and stoned; and, if so, will he explain why the police did not afford the Rev. Father M'Brien any protection, and will the ringleaders of his assailants be prosecuted.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Rev. Mr. M'Brien states he informed a constable in Cookstown early in the afternoon of the 1st August that he had been insulted on the road to Cookstown, and that he apprehended a renewal of insult, and possibly an attack on him when returning from Cookstown. I have ascertained that the rev. gentlemen drove from Cookstown at 10.30 p.m., and that stones were thrown at the occupants of his car without, however, inflicting injury. The police have made exhaustive inquiries, but, so far, have not succeeded in tracing the offenders, who are stated by the rev. gentleman to have been six or eight boys and girls. It is much to be regretted that the constable to whom he spoke in the afternoon did not make a report of the matter to his superiors. Had this been done, special precautions would have been adopted for his safety. Every effort has been made to trace the constable, but so far without success. He was, in all probability, one of the strange constables brought in for the occasion from other counties.

Rents in County Down.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state in how many cases the rents have been raised by Mr. Owens, lay Commissioner, in the unions of Banbridge, Newry, and Kilkeel (county Down), since 1st May, and the percentage of increase in each case.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have no information on the subject.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman obtain it?

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

The Earl of Shaftesbury's Antrim Tenants.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Earl of Shaftesbury, who is a member of the Congested Districts Board, has demanded from his county Antrim tenants a sum over and above the purchase price in consideration of the alleged suitability of their lands for building purposes; and whether he will direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to this matter, in view of the provisions of Section 1 of the Act.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. I have no knowledge of the matter referred to in the Question.

Limerick and Extra Police Charges.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain the reason why, in the case of the city of Limerick, which has refused to pay any charges for extra police for twenty years, steps have not been taken to enforce payment.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): Is it not the fact that no extra police were required in the city of Limerick owing to its peaceable condition?

Mr. WYNDHAM: The sum claimed against the Limerick Corporation extended over the period from 1st October, 1881, to 31st March, 1886. As the law then stood no satisfactory remedy for its recovery was provided. Many, if not most, of the members of the corporation who refused to pay are no longer members of that body, and successive Governments have declined to take proceedings against the corporation, believing that such proceedings would not have led to the recovery of the debt. The claim certainly does not come within the spirit of the 80th Section of the Local Government Act of 1898, nor is it considered to come within the letter of that enactment.

Extra Police Charges in Ireland—Exchequer Loss.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state who was the official whose action prevented the recovery of the charges for extra police from the counties of Sligo, Cavan, Clare, Fermanagh, Galway, Leitrim, Roscommon, Tipperary, and Waterford, and consequently entailed a loss of over £7,000 to the Exchequer.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have more than once stated that the Law Officers had advised there was no legal power to recover the charges in question.

Mr. LONSDALE: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the name of the Law Officers?

Mr. WYNDHAM: My hon. friend must know their names.

Veterinary Branch of Irish Agricultural Department—Promotion Grievances.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Treasury authority was obtained by the Agricultural Department for the appointment of a second division clerk in the veterinary branch as from the 1st of April last, who was to be brought in over the heads of the Catholic gentlemen who have been serving in that branch for ten years and upwards, and that the appointment was subsequently abandoned; and, if so, will he state upon what grounds it was desired to make the appointment, in view of its effect on the Catholic officials in the branch.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The appointment of an additional second division clerk has not been abandoned. The remainder of the Question repeats the unwarrantable and unfounded suggestion previously put forward and dealt with by me.

Veterinary Department Staff Salaries.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, of the seventeen clerks transferred from the Privy Council to the veterinary staff of the Agricultural Department, ten Protestants got increases of salary varying from £40 to £150 per annum, while of the seven Catholics two got an increase of £32 10s., and five were reduced from £92 to £90, although nominally made permanent, and that the salaries of the Protestant members of the staff average £360, and those of the Catholics £118 11s. 5d.; and, if so, what is the reason for the differentiation.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This is a repetition, in another form, of Questions previously put to me by the same hon. Member. I have nothing to add to the Answers already given.

Recruiting in Ireland—Disloyal Notices at Maghera.

Mr. GORDON (Londonderry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that on the occasion of the recent visit of the Inniskilling Fusiliers to Maghera, county Londonderry, the walls of the town were placarded with notices to the young men of Maghera warning them to keep out of the company of the British soldiers, and that whoever joined the British Army or kept company with soldiers was a renegade, and to remember that they owed allegiance to Ireland only; and whether he will take steps to prevent such placards being exhibited in future.

Mr. WYNDHAM: At my right hon. friend's request I will reply to this Question. Notices of the character mentioned were posted, and were at once removed by the police when discovered. The police have standing instructions to remove all such notices wherever found.

Mr. SLOAN: Is there any possibility of bringing to justice the authors of these notices?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Lace Frauds in Nice.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is now in a position to state the result of his inquiries into the facts alleged in the Nice Vice-Consular Reports as to the sale of counterfeit Irish lace in Nice; and what steps he proposes to take in order to safeguard the interests of this Irish industry.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: A report has been received showing that imitation Irish lace has been manufactured for several years at St. Gall and in Plauen, but I am still awaiting more definite information as to the description under which this imitation lace is sold in Nice.

Curragh Camp Building Contracts.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the contractor for building work at the Curragh Camp is employing unskilled labour in the execution of pointing door frames and window frames, whether this contractor is bound to carry out the Fair Wages Resolution of this House; and whether he will take such steps as will compel this contractor to employ regular tradesmen on such work as appertains to their several trades, and not to employ handy men on Government contracts.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am not aware of the matter referred to in the Question, but I have called for a report from the local military authorities.

Mr. NANNETTI: When I put the Question down it contained the name of the contractor?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I think the proper course is to refer all these matters to the local military authorities.

An HON. MEMBER: Does the right hon. Gentleman know the contractor is a Belfast man?

[No Answer was returned.]

Purchases of Army Remounts in Ireland.

Mr. FFRENCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the number of horses purchased in Ireland during 1903 for Army remounts; what was the average price paid for these horses; whether most of these purchases took place through dealers or middlemen, who had a profit alike on the farmer as well as on the Government; and whether he will consider the advisability of arranging that the farmers shall bring their horses into local depots for examination and purchase, thus constituting a direct transaction between the Government and the farmers of Ireland.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The number of horses purchased in 1903 in Ireland for Army remounts was 2,321 at an average price of £43 9s. 1d. They were purchased mostly through dealers. The suggestion made in the last paragraph of the Question will receive consideration, but I must point out that our experience of many years is that the farmer prefers the dealer, who is in a position to take all the young stock, to the Army purchaser, who is bound down to type, price, and soundness.

Mr. DELANY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what prices the breeders get?

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir.

Irish Local Loan Funds.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what interest is paid by the Treasury on money raised for the Local Loan Funds; whether he can state the interest charged on loans issued for 50 years periods for the purposes of labourers' cottages in Ireland; and whether he can state to what purpose the difference in the two rates of interest is applied.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): Money is raised for the Local Loans Fund by the issue of Local Loans Stock, which bears interest at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum. Recent issues have been made below par, so that the actual rate of interest paid is higher than 3 per cent. The rate of interest charged to local authorities for loans varies according to the period of the loan, being 3½ per cent. when the period does not exceed twenty years and 4¼ when it does not exceed fifty years. The difference between the interest paid and the interest charged on loans is applied to defraying the expenses of administration of the loans; any surplus which remains on the Income account of the Fund is carried to and accumulated in a separate account, as directed by Section 4 of the Public Works Loans Act, 1897. In the Public Works Loan Bill of this year it is proposed to apply the accumulations, so far as necessary, in making good the deficiency in the Capital Account caused by issues of stock at a discount.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Victor Cavendish said the rate of interest charged to local authorities was exactly the same as in England.

Postal Arrangements in County Sligo.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received a memorial from the clergy and people of Lavagh, Achonry, county Sligo, praying for additional postal facilities in that district; and, if so, whether he will grant the facilities asked for.

Lord STANLEY: The memorial referred to reached me on Friday last. I am having inquiry made and will inform the hon. Member of the result.

Irish Town Sub-Postmasters' Grievances.

Mr. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will say whether the report made on the 5th May, 1902, by a superintendent of the Sorting Office, Dublin, ascribing to design and fraud the withholding of increases of salary which had accrued to certain town sub-postmasters, was brought to the knowledge of his predecessor, or whether it was suppressed, contrary to the regulations and the undertaking given by the Postmaster-General in this House relative to memorials and appeals addressed to him; and in whose hands was that report when a decision adverse to the officer who made it was given by the Postmaster-General.

Lord STANLEY: I cannot find that there is any report on the subject referred to by the hon. Member dated the 5th May, 1902, but there is a report dated the 5th May, 1903, which seems to be the one alluded to in the hon. Member's Question. That report was laid before my predecessor in due course and it was in the General Post Office, London, when the decision referred to by the hon. Member was given.

Russian Seizures of British Ships—The Case of the "Malacca."

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, as stated in the Russian Official Messenger of Tuesday, 2nd August, the British merchant steamer "Malacca," forcibly seized in the Red Sea by the Russian armed vessel "St. Petersburg," and by her forcibly taken to Algiers, there had bulk broken and part of her cargo examined, by agreement between His Majesty's Government and the Russian Government; if so, can he state on what grounds His Majesty's Government made such an agreement; and why they agreed to any examination at all of the cargo unauthorised by any competent Prize Court.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): My hon. friend has put down Questions in considerable detail with regard to the "Malacca." Perhaps he will now allow me to give the view the Government entertain upon this incident. If he wishes to press me further, I shall be very ready to do my best to satisfy him. The House must remember that the objection we took to the seizure of the "Malacca" was due entirely to the fact that we thought that ships issuing out of the Black Sea under the commercial flag were not competent to turn themselves into cruisers in the circumstances of the "Smolensk" and the "Petersburg." We remonstrated, therefore, very strongly with the Russian Government, and they on their part showed a desire to meet us. The important thing to remember is that it was entirely a new case. It was the first time since the Treaty of Paris and the Treaty of London, on which our objection was based, that any such incident had occurred. If the Russian Government was right in its contention, the captors of the "Malacca" would have had the right to take her to a Russian port and try her before a Prize Court. If we were right, there was no justification for having taken the ship at all. The object we had in view was to prevent this new incident from developing into one which would cause a great condition of strain between the two countries—a condition of strain that might easily, in my opinion, have developed further. The actual arrangement arrived at was, as regards the "Malacca," in the nature of a compromise. The Russian Government gave up the idea of taking her to a Russian port, and they gave up the idea of having an examination of her cargo, and they gave up the idea of trying her before a Prize Court. They agreed that she was to be taken to a neutral port, and after a purely formal examination should be then and there released. It was also arranged that these two ships belonging to the Volunteer Fleet were no longer to act as cruisers. The whole substance of our contention was, therefore, I think, granted, and I confess I have not the smallest feeling of regret that we did our best to meet the Russian Government, who on their side showed no impracticable spirit in the matter. If my hon. friend wants further details, I shall be ready to give them, but I think, in substance, I have answered all the Questions he put to me.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I am obliged to my right hon. friend for his Answer, which, I may be permitted to say, I regard with much satisfaction, except that there may be made against us the assertion that we have admitted the right of capture by admitting the right of examination.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, no; that is not so.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Then I am perfectly satisfied. Will the right hon. Gentleman answer my next Question—whether the British Consul at Algiers officially certified that the military stores on board the British merchant steamer "Malacca" were the property of the British Government, and that the rest of her cargo was not contraband of war; if so, whence did he derive the knowledge which enabled him to make such a declaration; whether the Russian captors of the "Malacca" seized and had detained the ship's register, manifest, and other papers; if so, what steps were being taken to procure their restitution; and could he now, consistently with the public interest, state what stage the negotiations or other proceedings with regard to this matter had now reached.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The British Consul at Algiers did officially certify that the military stores were the property of the British Government, but all he did about the rest of the cargo was to give a general assurance of its innocence, and that was founded upon a study here at the Foreign Office of the ship's manifest. No official information has been received as regards the fourth point my hon. friend asks me about, that relating to the ship's register, manifest, and other papers.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Do I understand that no information is in possession of the Government with reference to the alleged seizure and detention of the ship's papers.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, we have no information on that score, and I feel pretty confident that the P. and O. Company would have told us if any such event had occurred.

The Sinking of the "Knight Commander."

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, have His Majesty's Government now ascertained, and can he state, the facts connected with the sinking of the British merchant ship "Knight Commander" on the high seas by Russian cruisers; and does he propose, before the House is adjourned for the recess, to make any general statement or to lay upon the Table any correspondence dealing with the seizure or sinking of British merchant vessels by Russian men-of-war, and alleged men-of-war, on the high seas.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: We really have no further information upon this subject than that I have already given to the House. There can be no doubt that the ship was sunk, that she was sunk by the Russian officers on the ground that it was extremely difficult to bring her into port, and on the further ground that she was undoubtedly carrying, in their opinion, contraband of war. We adhere to our opinion that these circumstances, whether true or not, afford no adequate justification for sinking a neutral ship.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: May I understand from the right hon. Gentleman that His Majesty's Government have by no means abandoned their position, but intend to adhere to it?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, no, Sir; we have not abandoned our position in the smallest degree.

Port of London Bill.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, having regard to the representations made to himself and to the President of the Board of Trade by London commercial, industrial, and other organisations, he is prepared to recommend the House to carry over the Port of London Bill to next session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade and I have come to the conclusion that it would not be advisable to ask the House to carry over the Port of London Bill to next session. I do not know that it is necessary again to express my regret that it should have been necessary to drop this Bill; if it be necessary I hereby perform that duty a second time.

The Colonies and the Fiscal Question.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider the advisability of instituting an inquiry by Royal Commission, or other suitable tribunal, upon which Colonial representatives may be placed, as to the fiscal or other measures which may be needful to enable the United Kingdom and the Colonies to co-operate for the defence of Imperial trade and for the promotion of freer trade within the Empire.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper—

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider the advisability of the calling of an Imperial Conference thoroughly to examine the fiscal situation of the British Empire.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall be glad if my hon. friends will defer these Questions till Wednesday or Thursday.

Telegraph Vote—Bradford Committee's Report.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state the date upon which the Telegraph Vote will be taken.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope an opportunity will be found for discussing this before Supply closes—probably to-morrow.

Mr. NANNETTI: And on that Vote we can discuss the Wages Committee's Report.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope so.

Specie Commandeered by the Boers during the War.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that time does not allow for the discussion of the claim against the Government in the matter of the specie commandeered by the Government of the late South African Republic from British banks, he will consider the advisability of leaving the matter to the decision of an arbitrator to be approved by both parties.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. I fear I can add nothing to my former Answers. His Majesty's Government have considered the whole question, and, as I have said, their views are fully embodied in their correspondence with the bank.

Naval Works Expenditure.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that the usual statement of expenditure under the Naval Works Acts has not yet been printed; whether he will take steps to expedite the printing; and what arrangement he has made for the usual discussion of the works in progress, some of which were assented to last year without information as to the works or the amount of expenditure involved.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that the Admiralty have done all in their power to expedite the printing of the statement, and it is hoped that the document will be in the Vote Office this afternoon.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Has the right hon. Gentleman overlooked the fact that the annual discussion has not taken place on this subject this session?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I can only arrange Supply in accordance with the general wishes of hon. Members. I have done all I can to arrange Supply to meet the general wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and I do not think I can be asked to do more.

Exports of Smokeless Steam Coal.

Sir LEES KNOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government exercise any and, if so, what control over the consignments or destinations of smokeless steam coal exported from Great Britain to foreign countries.

I beg also to ask the right hon. Gentleman if His Majesty's Government will take into consideration the desirability of making early provision to insure an adequate supply of smokeless steam coal for naval purposes in future years.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I may remind the hon. Member that this subject is being investigated by a Royal Commission, and until it reports I am unable to give an Answer.

Sir LEES KNOWLES: But may I remind the right hon. Gentleman that there has been exported recently to Russia 1,381,000 tons of steam coal and to Japan 87,000 tons.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. LONSDALE: May I ask the Prime Minister what are the intentions of the Government with regard to the Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland) Bill and the Constabulary Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no doubt that the Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland) Bill must be dropped, and I fear that the same must be said of the Constabulary (Ireland) Bill. It will not conduce to economy to drop this Bill, and I am sorry that we cannot find time for its discussion.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): What will be the business for the remainder of the week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: After Supply is concluded this evening the Government propose to take the Second Reading of the Cunard Agreement (Money) Bill as the first order and the Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill as the second order. On Tuesday the Scotch Estimates will be taken and the Post Office Vote, and, as at present advised, the Government will proceed with the Committee stages of the Cunard Agreement Bill and the Capital Expenditure Bill after twelve o'clock. On Wednesday the Education Vote will be taken, on Thursday the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, and on Friday the Indian Budget.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will no time be found for the Admiralty Vote?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot be sure that there will be time for it to be discussed.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: What about the Third Reading of the Welsh Coercion Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What Bill?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The Welsh Education (Defaulting Authority) Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot be certain at the present time, but I will give as early notice as I can.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to give any opportunity of discussing the revised Estimate for the Irish Development Grant which has been circulated, and, if so when?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall be glad to put it down on the Paper, but I cannot promise an opportunity of discussing it.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Are we to understand that the prorogation takes place Saturday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not able at this moment to give an answer. I cannot promise the Appropriation Bill by the end of the week. As to this evening's business, I do not promise to confine the attention of the House to the two Bills I have mentioned.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): When will the Irish Land Bill be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no chance of taking it to-night.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Supply of Electricity Bill, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

SEA FISHERIES BILL.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the

Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Sea Fisheries Bill, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc. — (*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

CHANTREY TRUST.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on the Chantrey Trust, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, etc. — (*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill. That they request that this House will be pleased to communicate to their Lordships a Copy of the Reports, etc., of the Select Committee appointed by this House in the present session on Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.

Printed Copy to be communicated.

That they have agreed to—Wild Birds Protection Acts Amendment (St. Kilda) Bill; University of Liverpool Bill.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the Re-vaccination of children after the age of twelve." [Re-vaccination Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill intituled, "An Act to transfer to the Army Council certain statutory powers and duties of the Secretary of State and other officers; and for other purposes connected therewith." [Army Council Bill [Lords.]

ARMY COUNCIL BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 296.]

NEW BILL.

CRIMINAL NEW TRIALS BILL.

"To make provision for a New Trial in certain Criminal cases," presented by Mr. Bousfield; supported by Mr. Lawson Walton; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 297.]

SUPPLY [21ST ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £331,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges of the War Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I trust that the Committee will not think it impertinent on my part if I begin the discussion again to-day. The only reason I do so is because it has been borne in on my mind that the elucidation of the proposals I made to the House was not adequate, and that I have left in the minds of hon. Members, and perhaps the public outside, a doubt which does not exist in my own mind as to the nature and the extent of the proposals which I desire to be discussed. As I am quite confident that the only chance I have of carrying with me the good opinion of this House and the country is to be perfectly frank and to say precisely what I mean, I ask permission to begin the proceedings of to-day with an attempt to explain further what evidently was left obscure on a previous occasion. I have been very much encouraged in the interval since I last spoke by what has taken place. I have received, in the first place, an immense amount of support and encouragement from quarters whose authority I recognise and whose opinion I esteem, and from many men throughout the country whose names are unknown to me, but whose support I value; and they have all combined to encourage me to proceed in attempting to carry out the task which I have undertaken. I certainly intend to respond, as far as in me lies, to the exhortations which they have addressed to me. I have received a large amount of criticism which has also encouraged me greatly, because I can vouch for it that, without any exception at all, that criticism has been of the character which I anticipated. It has been sporadic, local, or personal. It has been based on considerations, no doubt important, but still local or personal, affecting branches or portions of His Majesty's service; but in no single instance has it been based on a general review of the situation with which I consider myself called upon to deal. I anticipated that kind of criticism, and I do not complain of it. But it is because any Minister in my position has to meet that kind of criticism that I appeal once more to the general good sense of the House to take a wider view.

Since I last addressed the Committee I have had still further assistance in my task. I have had the opportunity of conferring with a large number of Members of this House, and of the other House, who either are at present serving, or have served, in some branch of His Majesty's service. It would be absurd to pretend that all of them saw eye to eye with me, or that some of them did not retain opinions which are not in consonance with mine. But the result of these conferences has been very salutary, and I think I have made some hon. Members realise that they and I are working really for the same object—the amelioration of the Army at a time when its amelioration is very necessary indeed. The principal facts remain exactly as I stated them. There is a danger—a very serious danger. I read a letter in one of the public prints which might have been written from Laodicea, by an ex-official of the War Office of Laodicea, and which said that there was no occasion for pressing this matter, but that the best thing to do was to leave matters alone. To leave things as they are at present! That is not my reading of the situation. Every day I spend at the War Office I become more and more convinced that there is need for action, and that something has to be done to stop, in the first place, the deterioration of the Army; and, in the second place, to decrease the enormous expense of the Army. Whether I have been able to suggest the proper way in which those evils can be arrested, I am prepared to argue. But there is no Member of the Committee who would deny that these two matters are pressing and that the policy of Laodicea, of doing nothing and pretending that all is well, will not be tolerated by this House.

I have said that the policy of the Government is to adopt frankly and openly the view that this country does not require a very large Army for home defence, and that it does require a larger and more efficient force for action over seas; that it is necessary to reduce that which is redundant and inefficient in our service, independent, of whatever branch of the service it belongs to; and that that must be done without fear or favour in the interests of efficiency and of economy. Those are the main outlines of the policy of the Government; and it is that policy which the Army Council is carrying out. I am perfectly prepared, and I am anxious, to discuss that policy with the House; but I do not say that I am prepared, and I am not anxious to go into the details of the execution of that policy prematurely. The work must be long and involves great detail and must be carried out with the best consideration which the Army Council can give to its execution; and it would be time thrown away if we were to devote the hours of to-day to discussing matters on which I cannot give a final answer—the actual dealing with this or that battalion or this or that branch of the service. I desire to confine this debate, as far as possible, to the general principles which, if they are accepted, will give us a chance of proceeding with our task. After those principles have been laid down by the Government, and have been endorsed by the House, the Army Council will charge itself with the duty of carrying out the details.

I have had plenty of critics. There have been critics who object to reduction of any kind. Some critics say that it is absolutely impossible to reduce expenditure at all. Others attack me for not having reduced it enough. There are those who say that it is perfectly right to reduce the number of men in the Army, but that on no account is that reduction to affect the Volunteers. I am told by others that reduction is an absolute necessity of the day, but that not a man must be taken from the Militia. Others have repeated the same argument only with this variation—that, while it is legitimate to reduce the Militia and the Volunteers, you must not touch a man in the Regular Army. Then attacks have been made on the policy adopted by the Government as an over-concession to what is known as the "blue-water school." I am told that it is an absolute error to accept the view that the defence of the country is to be found principally in the Fleet and not in the accumulation of men at home. That is a matter on which I am prepared to argue. But what I wish to make clear is, that I am in the position that every single Minister of War must be in when he proposes a reduction in cost and a reduction of men. Those two proposals must necessarily bring upon my head much condemnation. But if the Committee want either of those things—and I think they want both—they must support me, or whoever is in my place. There is not a man in any branch of the service who does not think that, whatever is done, he ought not to be affected. There is not a commanding officer of any regiment or battery who, if you proposed that his command should be touched, would not say you were wrong. And it is only by the support and goodwill of the country, which I believe I possess, and of the House of Commons, which I think I shall possess, that I can deal with this question as it ought to be dealt with.

I have presented three Papers to the House since I last spoke. One is a summary of remarks made by me on a previous occasion, presented in response to the request of the hon. Member for Bristol. Then, on the Motion of the Leader of the Opposition, I have furnished to the House another Return which, as far as I can make it, is a categorical reply to every one of the Questions which the right hon. Gentleman propounded; and, if it be not a categorical reply, all I can say is that it is not my intention which has failed. It is my desire to give to hon. Members on both sides of the House the whole of the material which will enable them to judge whether we are following the right or the wrong road towards the end which we all wish to attain. I have supplied another Return on the Motion of the hon. Member for Perthshire which deals with a portion only of the financial side of this question. In the first place, I must point out that it does not pretend to be an exhaustive statement of the reductions which I believe can be effected, and ought to be effected, in our army expenditure. It is a categorical statement of the results which will follow the reduction of certain units of the Army and the adoption of a certain course with regard to the organisation of the Army. But I make no secret of the fact that I should be very much disappointed if the figure which stands at the bottom of that table were to be the ultimate reduction of the cost of the Army. I am engaged upon an inquiry into the circumstances of other branches of the service which have not been dealt with, and I believe that there is there an opportunity for a large reduction; and, even on the Return itself, the Committee will find that there may be an opportunity for reduction within the limits of that Return on a branch of the service not included in any of the proposed reductions. There is a note in that Return about which I shall be challenged. It is the supposed comparison between one set of figures and another. I have been anxious to avoid any comparison whatever. It is not desirable. Whatever system may be adopted, there must be a degree of uncertainty as to its future development, and I should be merely misleading the House if I were to ask them to attach undue weight to calculations which must be hypothetical. But I should like to explain why it is that this particular note appears on this financial Return. It is really a matter, if I may say so, of financial purity—perhaps I should say of financial prudery. The difference which results is exceedingly small. The note says this:—"It is important to bear in mind that the particulars in this statement do not represent savings compared with the Estimates for 1904–5, which, in many important features, do not provide for the full normal cost of the present system," and so on. What that means is simply this, that you cannot take any absolutely constant figure. There are certain battalions which at the present moment are not up to the standard of strength; there are some branches of the Army which are over-establishment; and, therefore, if you are to make an absolute comparison at the present time, you must either take the actual figures or some mean which will represent the normal establishment which it is intended shall be reached. But I can assure hon. Members, having given that explanation, that the actual difference in the net result is exceedingly small, and that, though I permitted that note to appear in connection with my statement, it is not really one which need give rise, I honestly think, to any discussion, as it so slightly affects the figures which I have given as the result of the whole calculation.

I spoke of reductions, and when I speak of reductions I cannot help recollecting that I have been challenged very openly as to the propriety of making reductions at all. Now I want to give a challenge in my turn, and I want, when this discussion is over, to know exactly what the House of Commons thinks with regard to the theory which I propound. My theory is this—that we do want a large Army for service over sea; that a large part of that Army should not be mobilised except in time of war; that we do not want a large Army for the defence of the United Kingdom in time of war. Now, if that be so, and I find myself, as I do, with a very large Army upon my hands maintained solely for the defence of the United Kingdom in time of war, I ask whether it is not the logical, obvious sequence of that state of things that I should ask leave to reduce that Army. I want to know whether that is the view the House of Commons takes, and if I am asked to reduce that Army, in what direction it ought to be reduced. Surely there can be but one of two answers—reduce the ineffective part of that Army. Is there any ineffective part? Undoubtedly there is. I am not dogmatising on this question from my own inner consciousness, but am simply citing the conclusions arrived at by a competent body, appointed *ad hoc*, which for eighteen months has been deliberating on this question, and that body says this—that two branches of our Army are at the present moment unfit to take the field against a foreign enemy. I ask once more for what purpose are these troops maintained, if they are not to take the field against a foreign enemy? What enemy are they going to take the field against? Are they to shoot down the people of Whitechapel? The thing is absurd; and I conceive that my duty, as I understand it, is to provide, in so far as in me lies, that the reproach shall not be repeated twelve months hence, or at any rate three years hence, that we are maintaining troops who are not fit to face a foreign enemy. I find more in this particular document.

I find it stated—what, indeed, I know—that many of these troops are physically unfit for the field. We sometimes, I think, trifle with this question of war. I think I could convince all hon. Members that, so far from being fit to face a foreign enemy, we have thousands of men, receiving money from this House, who would not be admitted to serve in a foreign army at all, who would be put in the intendance, or transport branch, out of the active ranks. That is not an exaggeration. I am sure I could prove that fact; and if that be so, is not the lesson correct that I have tried to put before the Committee—namely, that you should concentrate and reduce your force, which is notoriously redundant and that you should increase the quality of that which you retain?

*SIR LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): And pay for efficiency instead of *per capita!*

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is a brief way of stating the end at which I wish to arrive. I shall, no doubt, meet with some criticism from those who represent the Volunteer force. I have already made it clear, I think, what is my general view with regard to the Volunteers; but evidently there is one matter which I have not made quite clear, and that is that I do desire most earnestly to proceed in this matter with the good will and the support of the Volunteer force itself. With that object I have already entered into consultation with some representatives of the Volunteer force. I am sanguine enough to believe that we shall eventually arrive at exactly the agreement I desire—that they will agree with me that it is in the interests of the Volunteer force, as it is in the interest of the nation, that we should consolidate the Volunteer force, make its units more efficient, and reduce its numbers. I have had a consultation on this subject with hon. Members of this House and with a great many other Volunteer officers. I hope I have persuaded them a little; I am quite sure that they have taught me much. They have convinced me, though indeed I required little convincing, that it is not desirable in the same unit to have two classes of efficients. That does not at all deter me from applying the policy which I desire to apply, or from endeavouring to secure that there shall be units which, having had an opportunity of giving to the nation better service, shall have better training and better officers than the others; and it comes rather *à propos* of this discussion that I should have just received from the Field-Marshal commanding at Salisbury the most valuable testimony to the excellent results of the application of this principle, which some hon. Members suppose to be a new one, but which as a matter of fact has been for some time in existence in the Volunteer force—that is to say, the principle of having two classes of efficiency, not in the same unit, but in separate units. I am confident that the correct solution of this problem is to be found in making a nucleus in the Volunteer force of men who are well trained, well officered, and accustomed to act together, and reinforced, if necessary, in time of war, by that large amount of invaluable military material which is to be found not only in the Volunteer force, but among those who have passed through the Volunteer force, and who are not able in time of peace to give that full time and attention which we desire these units should give. I repeat that I desire and intend to take counsel with the representatives of the Volunteer force, but subject to the policy which I believe is essential and to which I intend to adhere, that we must have reduction and we must have concentration. Apart from those two main principles, I attach little value to any particular application of method in order to attain those results. But I ask the co-operation of representatives of the Volunteer force, not only in this House but throughout the country, to enable me to attain that end in the interests of the force and of the Army.

I have before me an extract from a letter by an hon. Member of this House referring to another very important branch of the subject—the Militia. I thought I had made my views clear with regard to the Militia, but I have evidently not made them quite clear enough. I have in the name of His Majesty's Government given a pledge with regard to the Militia, to which, need I say, I intend to adhere. I have said that the idea never entered into my mind that any policy of mine should be directed towards the sweeping away of the Militia. That has never been my intention. It has never been in my mind. What has entered into my mind has been the adoption of measures which I honestly believe are calculated to give to the Militia an opportunity and a value such as they have never enjoyed before. But I cannot better describe my intentions than in the words of the hon. Member for Chester which I have before me. With only one sentiment I disagree. He says—

"The task is not a difficult one—"

I think if he sat at my desk he would know that the task was a difficult one; but this is the task—

> "Make your Militia an organised territorial Army to defend you against raids and supply reserves for the Regular Army in case of national emergency, raise the whole *status* of the force, give the officers a recognised position."

Now that, as far as I am concerned, is the whole duty of man in regard to the Militia; it is precisely the policy which I should desire to adopt with regard to the Militia. But I have given my pledge to the House, and that pledge has been repeated elsewhere, that no action shall be taken with regard to the Militia which is not consonant with the wishes of the Militia. I made that remark subject to some exceptions, and I want the Committee to understand clearly what those exceptions are. I ask the liberty now, and I intend to exercise it, to cut off from the Militia all that is clearly redundant and unfit for war. There are many battalions and many batteries of the Militia which, tested by any test you may choose to apply, are unfit for war. I do not think that this Committee, whatever view it may take of any other proposal I may put forward, will desire that I should ask it, when the Estimates come round next year, to spend money on units—I do not care whether they are of the Militia, the Volunteers, or the Regulars—which are plainly, tested by any test, unfit for war. And I propose and intend, and the Army Council intend, to take such steps to test the Militia and, either by combination or reduction, to eliminate those units or portions of units which are clearly unavailable for purposes of war. But with regard to the rest of the Militia they must stand as they now are, unless those who speak for them think it desirable to accept the proposal which I am prepared to make to them. As there has evidently been some misconception with regard to that proposal, I should like in a very few words to repeat it. I want to make my position clear. There are many battalions of Militia which are declining, many which are under-officered, many to which the description given by the Royal Commission is applicable. What am I to do? Am I to ask Parliament to continue to maintain those battalions *ad infinitum*? We have had a proposal made by the Royal Commission which, if adopted, would strike such a blow at the Militia, as they have long been constituted, that their constitution would be entirely changed in one important respect. The Commission propose that the Militia recruits, sometimes 200 or 250 men in the battalion, should be embodied for six months in the year, and that there should be, in addition to that, six weeks training for the whole battalion. What does that mean? That for seven months in the year the commanding officer, or whoever it may be who really does the work of the battalion, will have to devote his time to that battalion. I should like to take the Militia battalions and ask the Committee how many of these commanding officers are prepared to devote seven months every year to the interests of their Militia battalion.

What I believe would save the Militia would be the frank acceptance of the recommendation of my hon. friend the Member for Chester. Hon. Members speak about improvement. As long as I am at the War Office everything I can do shall be done to improve the Militia. But this question is tainted by one inherent vice. You have this radical difficulty, that the Militia is at present the recruiting ground for the Line. The Line lives on the Militia to the extent of nearly 20,000 men a year. What will happen if you make the recruiting for the Militia more attractive than the recruiting for the Line? The moment the scale is turned in that direction, the recruiting will flow from the Line to the Militia, and you will be sacrificing the interests of the Line to form your Militia. No Secretary for War could face such a state of things as that. We must have the Line. Our difficulty is to get the Line recruits in sufficient number and quality; and if we deliberately deprive the Line of one of its principal sources of recruiting we shall be *pro tanto* destroying the effect of our first line of military defence. Therefore it is exceedingly difficult to improve the Militia to any great extent, even though we were to adopt, lock, stock, and barrel, all the recommendations—all the valuable recommendations—made by the Commission. It has been said to me, "Why don't you stop Militiamen passing out of the Militia into the Line?" How are you going to do it? Who is to prevent men, who, I believe, enter for that sole purpose, passing from the Militia into the Line? Who is to prevent the officers of the Militia, who go into the Militia, sometimes to the extent of 90 per cent. of the subalterns, for that sole purpose—going into the Line? You cannot solve the problem that way.

I am sanguine enough to believe that the Militia may see their way to falling in with this suggestion which my hon. friend makes. What I have in mind is this. We have 124 battalions of Militia infantry. Some of those are not destined, I think, to a long continuance. Any one who knows the condition of some of those battalions will agree with me that it is not right to ask Parliament to consent to their continued existence. But when we have either absorbed or eliminated the unprofitable members, there will remain a large portion of the force. It should be possible to go to many counties and say to the Militia battalions: "Would it not be in your interests to become the territorial regiment of your county? Your officers are either desiring to go into the Line or to remain as territorial officers in their own county." I would say to the one, "Your wish is gratified. You become officers of the

Line after passing your examination." To the others I would say, "You become Reserve officers of your own battalion in your own county. All I demand from you is that you will pledge yourselves that in time of war you will go to the front with your battalion." Do you think the lot of these officers would be worse than it is now? At present for eleven months the depot is practically a deserted spot, tenanted only by a few recruits, by a Line serjeant-major and two or three officers, who are endeavouring to pass through their courses. What is the alternative I propose? That the Reserve officers of the battalion should go back and find a full battalion in possession of their own barracks in their own county, with their own comrades. I think that would be much more attractive and would be a more dignified situation for the officer than that which now exists in the case of some Militia officers.

With regard to the men, it is already proposed that the men shall serve seven months in their first year. I say that is not enough. I am asked why. The answer is this—that I know of no army in Europe, with the exception of the Swiss Army, which has yet been put upon a training of six months as dequate. We are not taking the pick nd flower of our country; we are taking the class of men who go into the Line, who go into the Militia—and we must remember that fact in all its bearings. I can find no military authority who will tell me that we shall be wise in contenting ourselves with a six months training, much less the one month's training we now get, in order to enable the Army so trained to take the field against a foreign enemy. The officers and men serving are entitled to have their interests considered, but I ask the men who enlist in the future to give two years service in the battalion and six years in the Reserve. We should give them better terms than they now enjoy. We should give them a more attractive form of service, but we should demand in return that in time of war we should not only have their services with the field army as a matter of grace, but as a matter of certainty. During the autumn, as I have promised, we will consider these matters, and we will do what we can to ascertain what is the true view of the officers and men of the Militia. I should, however, like to say this, that if it be necessary to eliminate the Militia altogether from the organisation and constitution of the foreign-going army, we shall not be divested of the duty of making such an army; and I tell the Committee plainly that the Army Council does not propose to pretend that the Militia force as at present organised is capable of taking the place of Regular troops. We shall have to create in these counties these territorial battalions, and until we have created them we shall not be able to effect the reduction in the existing Line battalions which I hope we ultimately may be able to effect. We must have the *cadres* for the Army in time of war, and if it should be considered necessary by Parliament to maintain the Militia, it must be maintained *in addition* to what the Army Council and the Government consider necessary as the striking force of the Army oversea.

I should like to say one word with regard to that branch of the Army, the Regular Army, in regard to which I have received far the least criticism and far the largest amount of support. I believe that in the proposals I have had the honour of laying before the Committee I have suggested many things which every officer in the Army has for many years been desiring. I believe I have suggested means by which our subaltern officers and our captains will be able to exhibit true interest in their profession. I believe I shall have given to the Commander of our Army in time of war a force ready at the first call such as he has never yet had. I believe we shall be able to put the cavalry on a better basis even than that on which it now stands. I will not enumerate the whole category, but I believe that what we desire to do, and what I trust the Committee is ready and anxious that we should do, is entirely in consonance with the view of officers and men of the regular army.

I have never concealed from myself the fact that the great difficulty which will beset me during whatever tenure of office I may hold, and which will beset my successor after me, will be the difficulty of recruiting. We are asking for fewer recruits, and we are giving better conditions; but that recruiting difficulty will always remain. I have never held any opinion but one as to the true way to overcome that difficulty. My way is to make the lot of the soldier a more attractive one, not in the matter of pay—that is not so important, the pay now offered being exceedingly good—but in the way of prospects when he leaves the service, and in the way of the amenities of life whilst he is in the service. The time will come when whoever is standing in my place will ask the House of Commons to sanction some expenditure—and I do not think it need be a large expenditure—for the purpose of improving our barrack accommodation.

I face the criticisms on the Regular Army with equanimity. It has been suggested to me that we are not supplying an adequate Army. I have proposed a reduction—I do not deny that; but you cannot reduce the Army without reducing the number of men in the Army. That, after all, is the position in which we stand. We say we do not require the number of men, and, therefore, if you take out all my figures, if you sum up all my arithmetic, you will find out that we shall have fewer armed men in the country when we have done than we had when we began. But as regards the Regular Army we hope to arrive at a conclusion which will not make it weaker, but will make it stronger for the purposes to which we desire to apply our Army. I challenge any hon. Member who has ever been in the service, or any officer now serving, to tell me whether, in his experience, he has known a time when an officer commanding a British army has been in the fortunate circumstances in which I desire to place him. For the first time, if we are allowed to pursue our proposals, we shall have 185 battalions of Regular infantry, or, roughly speaking, 180,000 men on mobilisation, with a large Reserve. We shall have 104 battalions out of the 185 which in peace time will not all be mobilised, but which will all be composed of fighting soldiers, and all, even without mobilisation, with the addition of the small number which must be added to a few of these battalions to bring them up to the nominal establishment known as war strength, will be capable of taking the field. I ask any one who knows the condition at the present moment of our infantry battalions whether that is the position in which we now stand. I hope also that we shall be able to give to the generals charged with the command of our troops in war the immediate call on a really mobilised force of some 15,000 or 16,000 men, without calling on a single reservist. We shall, we hope, be able to put the cavalry on a basis which will make it an even more manageable and more effective force than it is now. It has been suggested that we have been proceeding at haphazard in this matter, and I see that some great authority has said that we had made no endeavour to discover what the Army is for or what it ought to contain. I have said over and over again that I do not believe the last word has been said on this subject; I do not believe it ever will be said. I have always maintained that we do not know what the ultimate figure of the British Army may have to be; but we are working now on a known basis. We have at present in India fifty-two battalions of infantry. I do not speak of other arms because it introduces complications without helping the solution of the problem. These fifty-two battalions are actually mobilised up to full strength. We have in the Colonies thirty-seven battalions of infantry, including five garrison battalions, and we have the remainder of the Line battalions at home. We look forward to the time, and I think not without reason, when the number of infantry battalions in the Colonies may be reduced by eleven. I fully admit that, until you can reduce them by that number, the figures I give must be to that extent uncertain and problematical. That is the ideal before us.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): Does that exclude South Africa?

***Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER**: No, no, including South Africa. That is the figure we desire to work to. It is not a cast-iron figure, but it will fit in well with the proposal we have brought forward to have a smaller number of general-service battalions at home. That will give us fifty-two general-service battalions in India and the same number either in the Colonies or at home. Now, Sir, what would happen in the event of war? I am not going to discuss all the possibilities of wars in which we might be engaged, but I will take one possible, though I hope not probable, instance. I take a case against which we are bound to prepare, the case of a war in India. We have now some indication as to what infantry force is likely to be required for the reinforcement of the Army in India. The figure runs to 70,000 men, including the fifty-two battalions. We should send these fifty-two battalions, and when we have sent them we should have remaining in this country fifty-five battalions with a very considerable number of reservists still to be mobilised. When I speak of fifty-five battalions remaining at home I should like to steer carefully between the Scylla and Charybdis of those who think this number too great and those who think it too small. The fifty-five battalions may be mobilised or may not. If you take them unmobilised there would be 500 men to a battalion. If mobilised there would be 980 to 1,000 men to a battalion, and it lies with you entirely whether you call up from the Reserve the unmobilised reservists of these fifty-five battalions. In addition to this force of 70,000 or 80,000 infantry at home—and of course I have made allowances for all sick and casualties—you will have a force of 180,000 Volunteers. What I want to ask is whether the Committee think that is enough, or too much, or the right number. We believe it is a reasonable answer to the demands likely to be made upon us, and that is the answer we have adopted.

We have framed our estimates for the number of units we wish to establish on what we believe to be the probable demands that may be made upon us, with some regard for our power of fulfilling those demands. I want to go away after this debate is over with the feeling that, though there are, and must be, those who criticise what they believe to be the methods of the Army Council in carrying out and adapting these principles to the Army, at any rate there is no large measure of disagreement on the main lines of our policy. The carrying out of details is, after all, a matter for those charged with the administration of the Army, and I should be very loth, even if I were at present in a position to do so, to discuss them in this House. We must deal incidentally with a great many individuals, and all those matters are difficult and unpleasant very often, involving much consideration; but they do seem to me to come distinctly and clearly within the province of those charged with the administration of the Army, and as long as you have trust in those who administer the Army you may fairly leave those matters in their hands. What I hope the Committee will direct its attention to is the general principles we desire to adopt.

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON (Middlesex, Ealing) desired to call attention to the position of India in the scheme of his right hon. friend. The Committee would recollect that two years ago his right hon. friend the present Secretary of State for India brought in a scheme of Army reform which entailed an extra charge of £2,000,000 a year on the revenues of England and India. That scheme was much criticised, and was defended with great ability by his right hon. friend the Prime Minister and others, and in the forefront of the defence of that scheme they put the case of India, who was to pay £840,000 towards the scheme. It was the requirements of India which called for the creation of the vast Reserve at home. He was in rather a peculiar position at that time because, although he was a member of the Cabinet and responsible with the Cabinet for all these changes, he was then Secretary of State for India, and he had to formulate the objections of the Council of the Secretary of State and of the Government of India against the extra charge put on India. Eventually an arbitration took place. The justification of the extra charge was the creation of a great Reserve. It no doubt had an effect on the mind of the arbitrator, and he gave his decision against the Government of India. Now his right hon. friend the Secretary for War made an enormous reduction in the Reserve. It was well known that the number of reinforcements which in a certain emergency was required by the Indian Government was 100,000 men, and in the debate on the proposals of the present Secretary for India 120,000 was mentioned as the force which under the system of reserve about to be created would be capable of being sent to India.

His right hon. friend the Secretary for War said that in the proposals he had laid before the House he had the authority of his colleagues. In describing his scheme in the Paper recently published he desired to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that he stated that he left all his proposals in connection with the Militia in abeyance. If they were in abeyance, he did not think it fair to include them amongst those which the House was now considering. In the recently published statement there was included for the first time the formation of the thirty-three home-service battalions, but the creation of these battalions was dependent upon the abolition of the Militia. ["No."] Had the right hon. Gentleman the authority of the Government for including these thirty-three battalions in his scheme? He gathered that the right hon. Gentleman had not. But the result was that he was able to add some 17,000 men to the colours and 30,000 men to the Reserve. Assuming that the Militia was abolished, the thirty-three new regiments which it was proposed to create would not be in the same position as the other regiments of the Regular Army. Hitherto the men of the Regular Army always had the Militia behind them to take their place if they went abroad. But these thirty-three battalions which were to replace the Militia would be tethered to these islands. Apart from them, were there anything like 100,000 or 120,000 men available for India in an emergency? He identified himself with the language used by the Prime Minister in connection with an invasion of India. He had never taken a pessimistic view of the danger. The possibility of an invasion of India was to a large extent a question of organisation, of commissariat, and transport. It was a gigantic task and would strain the military resources of any country. But it was within the bounds of practical politics, and no Government would be justified in bringing forward any complete scheme of Army reform which did not take cognisance of the contingency. The Secretary for War was sanguine that he would be able to reduce the number of battalions quartered in the Colonies and abroad. He had never yet heard a Secretary for War who had not always been sanguine of being able to reduce the number of those troops. But they were living in an age of Imperial expansion, and Imperial expansion and the reduction of white troops abroad were two incompatible policies. If we were going to increase the area of our Protectorates, it would not be safe to entrust their protection entirely to coloured races officered by British men, especially if these races were homogeneous either in their nationality or in their religion. As the number of those troops increased it was absolutely essential that they should be strengthened and stiffened by a sprinkling of white men. Assuming the same number of battalions were abroad hereafter as now, what was the force which the Secretary for War under his scheme could send to India. He had calculated on a Reserve of 20,000 men from the long-service battalions. That was much too high an estimate, because it was calculated that no less than 6,000 of these men would be non-commissioned officers in the home regiments. He was sure there would not be more than 15,000 men available from the long-service Reserve. The reserve connected with the forty home battalions would number 35,000, so that the right hon. Gentleman had only 50,000 men to meet a minimum demand of 100,000 and a possible demand of 120,000 men. The country would be swept absolutely clean of every single soldier with over two years service; and the home battalions would be deprived of most of their officers and non-commissioned officers, who would have gone with the Reserve. Therefore, this proposal made a fundamental change in the dimensions of the Reserve, for which India had to pay; and he did not think it ought to be considered by the House until they had the opinions of Lord Kitchener, Lord Curzon, and the Secretary of State for India upon it. While he was at the India Office he used all his influence in cutting down the Indian garrison to the lowest possible dimensions. It could not be reduced; some people thought it was too low. But so long as they had a vast Reserve at home they might keep their garrison down. and in proportion as they reduced the Reserve they must increase the Army in India.

The Secretary for War proposed to separate the Army into two divisions, one with long service and the other with short service. The home battalions were to be cut out of all expeditions and military enterprises, and out of all the attractions and reward attaching to them. They were to be kept at the interminable drudgery of drilling recruits. Could any one believe that in these circumstances the two branches of the service would remain on an equality? The ability, the intelligence, the enterprise of the Army must gravitate into the foreign service. The result would be that the brains of the army would be abroad, and perhaps the reverse, to a considerable extent, at home. In India at the present moment there were two sets of British officers side by side. The pay of the officers with the native Army was higher than the pay of the officers with the British Army, because the former were subject to continuous service in India, and, therefore, liable to all the evils and dangers of a tropical climate. But if they converted a certain proportion of the British Army into what was practically an Indian Army it would be impossible to deny the officers the same pay as was given to the officers of the native Army. He did not say these objections were insuperable, but they were objections on which the opinions of military men, and military men alone, were valuable, and the Secretary of State's doubt about the scheme was that there was practically nothing behind it but his own *ipse dixit.*

There was one part of his right hon. friend's scheme to which he listened with great satisfaction. His scheme was based on the assumption that the Navy was able to protect this country from sudden invasion. He entirely agreed with that theory; but if they were going to reorganise the Army on that theory they must go further. The Fleet might protect the country against invasion, provided its base of operations was adequately protected. At present the defence of all the great naval fortresses was under the Army. Now, just think of what occurred in the present great war between Japan and Russia. The Japanese, taking advantage of the insufficient defence of Port Arthur, went in and attacked the Russian fleet at anchor. They so disabled that fleet that they got command of the sea, and the whole of their extraordinary successes were due to the disablement of the Russian fleet. There was not a country in Europe which trusted the protection of its naval base to the Army. No man could man the forts who did not understand the movement of troops and the handling of guns, and there was only one body of men who combined this knowledge, and these were the Marines. He hoped his right hon. friend would give his energies and attention to this matter. All that was required was to transfer a certain proportion of the Garrison Artillery into Marine Artillery, and put them under the Admiralty, and to convert the Militia and Auxiliary Forces in the neighbourhood of Portsmouth, Chatham, and Devonport into Marines.

Lord George Hamilton.

He thought the Government were entitled to the greatest credit for having swept away the absolutely impossible system of military administration which had so long prevailed at the War Office. He had had twenty years experience of the Admiralty and the India Office, the two Departments which transacted most business with the War Office, and he was not only expressing his own views, but those of almost every naval man and every Indian administrator and soldier with whom he had co-operated, when he said that the system was absolutely unworkable. The secret of the comparative success of Admiralty administration could be stated in a sentence. The Admiralty had the good sense 200 years ago to get rid of the Lord High Admiral, and decentralise his duties, whereas the War Office had the misfortune 100 years ago to create a Commander-in-Chief. No man could adequately discharge his duties either at the Admiralty or at the War Office if he had not access to the innermost mind of his military and naval advisers; and so long as the military men at the War Office were under the Commander-in-Chief, no Secretary of State could get the military men, such was their sense of discipline, to state opinions which were not in accord with those of the Commander-in-Chief.

He entirely agreed as to the necessity for a Defence Committee; but the composition of this Committee was such, with one member the Prime Minister, and the appointment on it of Sir G. Clarke, who had strong views of his own, that it would fundamentally alter the functions of the Committee and determinedly affect the *status* both of the Secretary of State and the First Lord of the Admiralty. The scheme would work well enough under the present Prime Minister, but what would have been the position of the First Lord of the Admiralty or the Secretary of State for War with a man of the vigour and personality of Mr. Gladstone as head of the Defence Committee? In any case strong views of retrenchment and economy were likely to influence the next Prime Minister more than the present one. They ought to try and ensure continuity of policy, and they could only do that by spending much the same amounts and continuing establishments on much the same scale. He would suggest to the Prime Minister the desirability of drawing up rules more clearly defining what were the proper functions of the Defence Committee, and what they were not to do. At present they were told it was to be an advisory Committee. Lord Esher's Committee was to be an advisory Committee, but he had never read a more mandatory Report than that they gave.

To the Secretary of State for War he would suggest that he might do well to hold his hand a little. Many of his ideas were excellent, but he was about to embark on a scheme which if it failed would work great disaster to the country. The other day he informed the House that only 12 per cent. of the recruits under his right hon. friend's scheme had volunteered for long service, and yet he calculated that 43 per cent. of the recruits hereafter would volunteer for long service. What authority had he for the anticipation, and what inducement could he offer to the soldier to make up the astonishing difference? It seemed to him that the deterrents to undertake long service more than balanced the inducements. He suggested to his right hon. friend that in the interval afforded by the recess he should take the advice of the most competent men he could consult in respect of his scheme. At present there was nothing but the right hon. Gentleman's own statement; and the Committee must remember that all these propositions submitted now were the reverse of what every Secretary of State for the last thirty years had laid down. Every other Secretary of State, however, had been able to claim the support of his military advisers for his proposals; and if the right hon. Gentleman could get persons of authority to support his views and to say that what were now paper theories were capable of realisation, that they would reduce expenditure and improve the Army, that they would weld into a harmonious whole all the defensive and offensive forces of the Empire, then he would be able to overcome the opposition in the House and out of it. If he could not do that, then it would not be unreasonable to expect the House to agree to a crude series of proposals which if they failed would involve the Army in serious disorganisation.

*SIR A. HAYTER (Walsall) said he was satisfied that hon. Members on both sides of the House interested in Army matters would congratulate the Secretary of State for War on obtaining another day for the discussion of the Army Estimates, because he felt that the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman needed further explanation. He rejoiced that the right hon. Gentleman had been able to reduce fourteen battalions of the Line and five battalions of the garrison regiments, but there were other directions in which a saving might be made of from £500,000 to £750,000. As to the Reserve, he thought it would be admitted that this was not a very fortunate time for making any alteration in the position of the Reserve. It would be remembered that a most excellent example had been shown in the South African War by the way in which the Reserve men joined the colours in ten days, afterwards shortened to a week, and were on board ship in fourteen days, the ships not being ready before. The position of the Reserve was now going to be altered, costing the country more money. He wished to associate himself with every speaker in another place in saying that whether this new scheme was good or bad it was not possible to get the number of recruits required on the terms proposed. He contended that nine years service must count for pension. When General Peel introduced the service for ten and eleven years the first period counted for pension at the end of twenty-one years. They were cutting a man off from civil life between nineteen and twenty-eight years, and they gave him three years with Reserve pay instead of nine. A contrast had been drawn between the number of men who earned their pension in 1886 and 1896. He could assure the Committee that in the former period it would be found that the number of corporals was double and the number of privates triple who went in for pension, compared with the latter. There was no provision made by the right hon. Gentleman for future employment, except for the non-commissioned officers, and even these would find some of their places filled up from the home-service battalions. Two years for the home Army were too short a period for discipline, and he pointed to the success of the three years system in the Guards.

He offered to the right hon. Gentleman the suggestion of some reductions which might be affected that had not yet been mentioned. Might he ask the attention of the Committee to the position of the Guards. A few years ago the Guards were increased by the number of three battalions to balance the linked battalion system, and by taking upon themselves some of the duties of the Mediterranean garrison. The result of that increase was to add one battalion to the Coldstreams, one to the Scots Guards, and one to the Irish Guards. But what was the use of keeping up the establishment of the Guards beyond what it was in the past when the Mediterranean service was given up? What he suggested to the right hon. Gentleman was that, although as a matter of sympathy it would be undesirable to disestablish the Irish Guards, he ought to reduce the strength of the Coldstreams and the Scots Guards to what it was before the Mediterranean garrisons were established. If that were done there would be a saving of £131,000. That was a very considerable item. He could speak from experience. He was ten years in the Guards himself, and he knew that their duties were not increased; and at any rate, the reduced battalions could perform all the duties demanded of them.

Well, then, they came to the larger question—to the proposal which, he understood, was before the Cabinet but not before the Committee, and which, he thought the Committee would agree, was absolutely just. The cost of the garrison in Egypt was £500,000, and of that Egypt paid only £37,000. India paid for a garrison of 230,000 men. Why should we not in justice to our Indian fellow subjects ask Egypt to pay for the garrison which she enjoyed? Look at the condition of the Egyptian finances. Egypt had a surplus which was recorded by Lord Cromer in his last Report in the following terms—

> "For many years it was the practice to frame the Revenue Estimates of the Egyptian Government with the greatest caution. By the end of the year 1901 it was thought sufficient proof had been obtained to show that the growth of revenue which had characterised previous years was not due to any temporary or accidental causes, and that a further increase could be confidently anticipated in the future. The experience gained in the last two years, as also the present indications of the growing prosperity of the country, fully justified the belief that the revenue would rise."

Now, the actual figures of the revenue for Egypt were for 1903 £12,464,000 and the expenditure was £11,720,000, leaving a surplus of £744,000. From that surplus he maintained that Egypt ought to pay for her garrison; and he was at a loss to understand why the proposals had never been made. There was another reduction which he would suggest. He did not think that the Committee could be aware of the enormous increase which had taken place in the Yeomanry Vote. The original Vote before the War was for 10,000 men for actual service, and their cost was £78,000. Now, on the present Estimates the Vote was for 27,054 men at an estimated cost of £468,000. Therefore expenditure on the Yeomanry had increased more than five times, whereas its strength had not increased three times. He thought the Secretary of State ought to look in the direction of mounted infantry or elsewhere in order to effect a reduction in the expenditure. Then there should be a reduction in the garrison in South Africa. He thought his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean would agree that it was perfectly ridiculous to keep up a garrison of 21,000 men in order to discharge police duties in South Africa. They should not allow the Transvaal or the Orange River Colony to let down their police force to 5,000 men, in order that this country might pay for soldiers to discharge police duty, which was always a very unpopular service. In his opinion, the garrison in South Africa should be reduced to 12,000 men; certainly, it ought to be reduced far below 21,000 men. Then there was the question of the reserve of stores. Surely the stores ought to be reviewed from time to time. With a decreased force they could not possibly want the reserve of clothing, ammunition, and other stores which had been provided.

He had listened with very great interest to what the right hon. Gentleman had said about the Militia. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not carry out his scheme in its entirety; but he did hope he would ask the advice of Militia officers and accept it *bona fide* with a view to making the Militia an active force and mending rather than ending it. The Militia gave 14,000 men to the Line from their reserve, 2,000 officers and 40,000 recruits to the Line, and they sent into the field 1,691 officers and 43,875 rank and file. The men who went out did not want drafts of mature men to strengthen them; they went out as they stood on parade, although there was absolutely no obligation upon any of them. That was very creditable to the Militia; and he did not think that the right hon. Gentleman need be afraid, if war came, that the Militia would not be able to fulfil their duties. The reasons for the decadence of the Force were obvious. The Duke of Norfolk's Commission reported as follows—

"The training place of the Militia, for certainly two years out of every three, ought to be within its recruiting area. Training away from home is almost as certain, though ont so rapid in its depleting effects, as an ill-chosen time of the year, with this additional disadvantage, that it is almost certain to lower the class of both officers and men who enter the Militia battalions. To the officer or private of no fixed residence it does not make much difference where the training takes place. Not so the gentleman of good local position who likes to entertain his friends, and induces them to apply for commissions for their sons. The non-commissioned officers and men like to walk out with their friends, and be seen at drill and recreation. This keeps up a military spirit, and is invaluable for recruiting purposes."

He cordially endorsed that opinion. He could not understand why the commanding officer of a Militia regiment could not appoint, promote, or transfer a sergeant in the permanent staff, and why he should not be allowed to select his adjutant and quartermaster. The Duke of Connaught said that the officer commanding a Militia battalion ought always to command, and have a general supervision of his regiment, whereas he was now allowed into barracks out of training once to inspect his recruits. Then sergeants at the depot were allowed to make 2s. 6d. out of recruits passing from the Militia to the Line. That should not be. He saw great possibilities in the Militia; and he hoped it would be rendered a thoroughly good and effective force.

There were one or two points in the Report of the sacred Esher Commission which appeared to call or comment. This was to be a scheme of decentralisation; yet the Adjutant-General had all the duties of Commander-in-Chief except inspection. Instead of that, he had to look after recruiting, the Auxiliary Forces, the medical services, and the Judge Advocate-General and military law. It would be impossible for the Adjutant-General to discharge all these duties. He was perfectly certain that unless the Auxiliary Forces had a representative of their own at the War Office the Regular Army would be regarded as the first consideration. Then the Quartermaster-General had all the arrangements connected with the supply and issue of arms and equipment and stores to the troops, as well as the administration and distribution of the Army Ordnance department. The Master-General of Ordnance had to settle reserves of arms of all kinds, and also provide for the inspection of guns, small arms and ammunition. One officer appeared to supply arms and another to issue them. The Adjutant-General had control of education and supervised all the military colleges and schools in the Kingdom, whilst the First Military Member had to supervise the appointment of the higher staff of the Staff College and the Cadet Colleges as well as instruction at the examinations for the Staff College and the Cadet Colleges. With regard to the Inspector-General of the forces, the position could not be better filled than it was at present; but he should like to know what duties would in future be performed by this General officer beyond those performed by the Generals Commanding-in-Chief. The soldier would be inspected by the Inspector-General, drilled by the Generals Commanding-in-Chief; administered by the District Major-General; and paid by the Brigade Colonel. He would impress on the right hon. Gentleman very seriously to consider a very much greater reduction. The right hon. Gentleman could save £413,000 in Egypt, and if he reduced the Guards to what they were in the past, he would save £131,000. A further reduction of £200,000 could be effected in the Auxiliary Forces.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he had heard many War Office schemes propounded at various times since 1876; but he was bound to state that he had never heard one which had given him greater satisfaction, one that promised greater efficiency and economy, or was more in accordance with common sense and the requirements of the country, than the scheme of the present Secretary of State for War. For twenty years the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean had been proposing a long-service Army for the tropics and a short-service Army at home; but his proposal had up to now fallen on arid ground. They could not have a long-service Army abroad and at home. The squeezed lemon idea was now exploded. It was not good business to send men to India with only twelve months to serve, and then to have to bring them back at the expiration of that period. With regard to the proposed reduction, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Oldham had said that we wanted a smaller and cheaper Army, and the hon. Gentleman was right. We could not have the largest Fleet in the world and at the same time the most expensive Army. This reduction was absolutely necessary. As to the fourteen battalions of the Line which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to wipe out, they were not regiments which had 200 years of splendid history behind them; they were only regiments raised quite recently, and no harm would be done by their suppression. The garrison battalions were the apostolic successors of these regiments. They were the most expensive regiments he had ever heard of. Everybody knew the way in which they were raised; they could not march twenty miles; they measured more round the waist than round the chest; they cost the country a great deal of money, and he was glad to see that they were to be reduced.

With regard to the Militia everybody knew very well that the Militia had a great deal of influence outside the House and in another place. He would rather see the Militia amended than ended, but he did not see how that could be done. What could they do with a force 50 per cent. below strength, which had no officers, no transport, and no guns? As to the Volunteers, everybody knew that 20 per cent. were inefficient, and were only kept upon the roll in order to get the grant. The right hon. Gentleman had not alluded to-day to compulsory service; he had alluded to it six weeks previously, and he (Sir Carne Rasch), was glad to see that the right hon. Gentleman was going to drop it; not that he had any respect for those young gentlemen all through the country, who did not play polo because it was too dangerous, and football because it was too rough, and who did nothing but play lawn tennis and keep tame rabbits: who did not join the Militia or the Yeomanry, but skulked behind the Volunteers. He would like to see the noses of those young men put to the grindstone. He was glad we were to have a striking force of 16,000 men at Aldershot. If there had been such a force at Aldershot in 1899, instead of the sham Army Corps, we should not have had the things that occurred in Natal and Ladysmith. The opinions of the War Office were perhaps a little pessimistic, but he suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should stick to his guns and carry out his scheme in its entirety.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) thought that whatever opinions might be entertained in the Committee on the relative scheme of the Secretary of State for War and its effect upon the Volunteers and the Army, there were two things which would command respect and agreement. In the first place, the Secretary of State added to the knowledge of the Department profound and comprehensive knowledge of his own upon a subject to which he had given long years of study. In the second place, in the suggestions which he had made he had considered, not his own view or that of his Party, but the best interests of the country. The right hon. Gentleman had dealt with the question in a spirit of candour and openness and great courtesy. The attitude of mind in which the right hon. Gentleman had approached his great task was one that had won for his proposals, as far as possible, unprejudiced consideration, so that they would not be affected in their consideration by the House by the recollection of other proposals on the same subject that had been made in years gone by. It was quite true that there was a formidable indictment to be promulgated against the military policy of the last five or six years, and he looked forward to a more appropriate opportunity of arguing the indictment both here and elsewhere. He did not think that it would be appropriate to go into the subject that afternoon, nor was it necessary, because the right hon. Gentleman had expressed his opinion very clearly and frankly upon the results produced on the Army during the last six or seven years. He would give a history of what had been done during that period: first, there was the Order in Council in 1895; then the increase in 1898 by Lord Lansdowne; then the war increase by Lord Lansdowne in 1895–1900, made, no doubt, very properly under the stress of the war; then the Army Corps scheme introduced in 1901 by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India; then came the change of pay and of service in 1902, and then in 1903 we had the Council of National Defence. That brought him down to the Esher Report and the far-reaching revolutionary scheme of the War Office. All these schemes varied in their character but had one feature in common. All of them had been accompanied by a steady increase in the Army Estimates. Throughout the whole of this period the power of the Government over the Army had been made absolute. Whatever demands had been made by them had been ratified, and no grant of money had been denied. The changes they had effected had been continual, and this was what the present Secretary of State for War thought fit to say with regard to the results achieved. The right hon. Gentleman, speaking on behalf of his colleagues in the Cabinet, and with the authority of the Army Council, said that the Army upon which this expenditure had been lavished, and upon which these reforms had been made, was an Army the conditions of which were unsatisfactory and which was not sufficiently organised; that the artillery of our Army was inferior to the artillery of any other civilised army in the world, and that it was an Army which, besides being imperfectly prepared, wasteful in its methods, and unsatisfactory in its results, was one of the most unsatisfactory that was ever designed. There was no one who could possibly add to such a statement. He thought the Secretary of State erred a little on the side of severity when he described the British Army in those terms. It was important to have the measured opinion of the Secretary for War, not expressed in the hurry of the moment, but set forth in a cool official Memorandum on the work of Army reform for a long past time.

The immediate proposals of the right hon. Gentleman divided themselves into two parts — those affecting the Regular Army, and those affecting the citizen Army. As to the Regular Army, the reductions proposed were not so large as some had hoped, but they were very considerable. The first five items on the White Paper which had been supplied, aggregated, according to his calculation, a reduction of 36,000 men, excluding any reduction that might be made in the artillery and also in the land forces due to the transfer from the Army List to the Navy List of that branch of the service known as aquatics. He understood from the ex-Secretary for India that the formation of thirty-three home-service battalions was contingent upon the general acceptance of the proposals regarding the Militia, and therefore he left that item out of calculation. If that were so, they could see that the financial results of the reduction were somewhat disappointing. In the last five or six years they had added 53,000 men to the Regular Army and added to the cost something over £10,000,000. They now took off 36,000 men and reduced the expenditure only by £2,000.000 or £2,500,000 a year. If this were true it was quite clear that the Secretary of State for War was right when he suggested to the Committee that the financial side of the question had not yet reached its final form. He held very strongly that the Committee ought to welcome the reduction in men and money which was now proposed. He believed that these proposals were a brave and honest attempt to control the rapidly increasing cost of the Army. They should congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the abandonment altogether of the Army Corps scheme. The Secretary of State said he abandoned it because he wished to make the words "Army Corps" harmonise with the ordinary significance of the term. But the objection had not been of a purely terminological character; the right hon. Gentleman must not suppose that it was a mere quibbling with words. It was the object of the ex-Secretary for War to make six real Army Corps; three of them were to be thoroughly equipped with all the requirements of an Army Corps. That scheme was objected to because it was not the best way of arranging for troops who would in all probability have to serve over-sea; and it was contended that the divisional organisation wohld be much better. It was also objected that the Army Corps system embodied in a permanent form all the great expansion which had been thought right, and probably was right, during the emergencies and emotions of the South African War. He would urge the Committee to welcome, at any rate in principle, the reductions which the right hon. Gentleman proposed. It was a matter of immense importance, having regard to the general political situation of the country, that a Conservative Secretary of State for War should stand up and give expression to such sentiments. He believed that those who in future had to deal with the Army problem would be very grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for the statements he had made, and that in that way he would have rendered real service to the cause of retrenchment.

If the Committee gave general support to the principle of reduction it was obvious that they should give sympathetic consideration to the right hon. Gentleman's methods. The objections which had been urged against the linked-battalion system might have led to misunderstandings. The criticisms had been well directed in part, but they were not well directed so far as they referred to the aspect of the system which concerned the feeding of battalions abroad by drafts trained in battalions at home. The officers did not like the system, but that did not prove it was a bad system. It was a matter on which military officers were not impartial. Parliament had to consider not what was most congenial to the officers, but what was cheapest and most efficient for the public service. From that point of view he would be sorry to commit himself to the statement that the method of feeding the battalion abroad by drafts of men trained in the battalion at home was an unsatisfactory method of carrying on the Army. But what the criticism had always been properly directed against was the theory that it was necessary to have one battalion at home for every battalion abroad. The equipoise of battalions was not necessary and ought to be abandoned. The true economy of the linked-battalion system doubtless reached its perfect development when there was an equipoise of battalions, and that fact enhanced the wisdom of Lord Cardwell's arrangement at the time it was made, because the number of battalions we then required to keep abroad did not largely exceed the number of battalions which for a quite different set of circumstances we thought it convenient to keep at home. But as the Empire had extended its responsibilities the absurdity of creating a new battalion at home for every battalion added aboard became patent to all, and that had raised a body of criticism which had perhaps led the right hon. Gentleman to believe that the system was more generally distrusted and disliked than was actually the case. So long as the axiom was admitted that for every battalion abroad there must be a battalion at home, the advocates of Army increase had an irresistible lever for enlarging the number of battalions in the Army, and it was against this theory rather than against the use of linked battalions for drafts that the advocates of Army reduction had principally protested. He welcomed the present scheme because it disposed once and for all of the theory that a counterpoise of battalions was necessary for reliefs, inasmuch as the right hon. Gentleman proposed to maintain the circulation of the Army by a system which would keep four battalions abroad for every one at home.

*MR. ARNOLD - FORSTER: Three battalions abroad.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that that was at any rate an admission that it was not necessary to maintain an equipoise between the battalions abroad and the battalions at home. As to the substitution of a dual Army for the linked-battalion system, the change was so vast that it was almost impossible to pronounce at once a definite opinion of any value. No one would deny that the old system whereby recruits joined, and Reservists when called up, rejoined, not a depôt, but a real live marching regiment, the system whereby the battalion at home and the battalion abroad reciprocally nourished each other, the battalion at home sending out young soldiers to refresh the battalion abroad, and the battalion abroad sending home seasoned Reservists to sustain in the hour of need the battalion at home—like the tree whose leaves fall back every year to fertilise the soil from which it draws its strength—the system was so complete and compendious as regarded its influence upon recruiting, mobilisation, and the general economy of the Army, that to abandon it now constituted the most supreme and irrevocable departure in military policy that had been proposed from the Treasury Bench since the abolition of purchase forty years ago. He did not contend that the linked-battalion system was the only, or the best system for drafts or for relief, but it was a very good system, even with the counterpoise, and it was impossible for the Committee to decide whether or not the proposals now made were an improvement upon the old method. When he said "improvement," he meant whether these proposals would in fact produce in the hour of need a greater development of force in proportion to the money spent, and that was a question which could not be answered without great detailed calculation and an amount of technical knowledge which the Committee could not pretend to possess. Military men had come to the conclusion that the battalions under the new system of mobilisation would be in every respect inferior in fighting value to the battalions produced in 1897 under the old system, which cost at least £10,000,000 less than the system now proposed. He did not desire to throw obstacles in the way of the right hon. Gentleman. They could not forecast the results of the departure proposed, and their judgment must therefore be suspended until they saw the results. The Committee did not desire to impede or discourage the right hon. Gentleman, they were grateful to him for the spirit he had shown. If, however, the Committee tacitly acquiesced in the changes now proposed, he hoped they would not be told at some future time, when perhaps the scheme had failed, that hey had agreed to the scheme, and that they would therefore be inconsistent if they pointed out the defects and the directions in which it had failed. Quite apart from the merits of the scheme, which he admitted, he did not feel himself competent to form an opinion.

Was the new scheme practicable? Would 12,000 men of nineteen years of age enlist each year for nine years colour service, the overwhelming proportion of which must certainly be served in the East? That was the vital and cardinal question before them. A collateral advantage of the old system was that foreign service was mixed up with home service. A man joined the Army and took the rough and the smooth service in England or in the East, but it never presented itself to the recruit when he signed the paper that he condemned himself to six or seven years of certain exile in the East. Would the recruit be tempted by anything which the right hon. Gentleman could offer him to take that solemn step? He felt the greatest doubt and anxiety on that point. Would sixpence a day make the difference to the man who had the choice of shipping himself off to the East for five or six years when he could serve for two years in his own country and after that have six years in the Reserve with pay in civil life? The right hon. Gentleman, no doubt, believed that he would get the 12,000 men each year, but he doubted it. If the right hon. Gentleman happened to be wrong over this matter a disaster would be inflicted upon our Army and the catastrophe both with regard to efficiency and economy would be far-reaching and permanent. The Army was not an inanimate substance, it was a living thing. Regiments were not like houses; they could not be pulled down and altered structurally to suit the convenience of the occupier and the caprice of the owner. They were more like plants; they grew slowly if they were to grow strong; they were easily affected by conditions of temperature or soil; and if they were blighted or transplanted they were apt to wither, and then they could only be revived by copious floods of public money. That was true with regard to any Army, and it was still more true with regard to a voluntary army. How much more must it therefore be true of the units which composed the Volunteer citizen Army.

In the reduction the right hon. Gentleman proposed in the Volunteers and Militia, he could not follow him at all. Those who had made the defence of the soil the principal plank of their military platform were bound to resist the proposal to reduce the Auxiliary Forces and to intercept the supply of men by which they had been sustained. He did not wish to say anything against Royal Commissions, but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not pay too much attention to the Report of the Commission on Army Reform. That Commission accumulated evidence to sustain a proposal in favour of conscription. Nobody had more effectively demolished the conclusions of that Commission than the right hon. Gentleman, for he had held them up to ridicule and had shown that their conclusions in regard to conscription were absurd and unnecessary. Was it too much to ask that the same critical eye should be turned on the premises of that Commission as upon their conclusions. Just as the right hon. Gentleman had been able to show that conscription was not so cheap and easy as this Commission had maintained so he would be able to show that the Volunteers and the Militia were not so bad and worthless and useless as the same Commission had seen fit to report. Did the Committee realise the immensity and the revolutionary character of the changes in the Auxiliary Forces which the right hon. Gentleman had proposed? He did not intend to deal with the Militia because he understood that that branch of the subject was only to be dealt with if public opinion would allow it, and he was convinced that public opinion would not allow the Secretary for War to carry out his proposals in that direction. If Militia recruiting had suffered it was because the length of service in the Regular Army had been reduced. By throwing open three years service to the Regular Army they had not only affected recruiting for the Guards but also for the Militia, and that might be the reason why the extra Vote had not operated to swell the ranks of the Militia battalions. If the right hon. Gentleman was able to revert to the seven and five years system on which this country had developed a great military force at a small expense he would find the Militia very much strengthened. They ought not to forget that the Militia did send 90,000 men to the South Africa War. How could it be said that they were unfit for service when they utilised 90,000 of them on active service, and when without their aid they could not have held their lines of communication and garrisoned their Mediterranean possessions in the hour of need.

With regard to the Volunteers the proposals to reduce them were much more alarming and far-reaching. The present establishment of the Volunteers was 340,000, and it was now proposed to reduce it to 200,000. It might be said that the present establishment existed only on paper, and did not matter, but it did matter that the Volunteers should be capable of great extension in times of emergency, and that during the danger of an invasion many thousands of men should be willing to join as was the case during the late war. Look at the strength of the Volunteers. They were 280,000 after the last general election when the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India made his proposals to the

House, but the total had fallen to 240,000 on the 1st of January this year. Now it was proposed to reduce them to 180,000 men. So that in five years 100,000 real live Volunteers who were real self-respecting citizen soldiers had gone from the Army and were to be struck off the defensive forces of the country. And what was to be done with the remainder? They were asked to say, "Our patriotism and our desire to sacrifice ourselves for our country is so great that we desire to become second-class Volunteers." That was absolutely subversive of discipline and destructive of a healthy spirit. Some 60,000 Volunteers were to form a sort of residuum and they would be a kind of sham Regulars drawn from other battalions of which they had been the strength, and boiled down into a kind of imitation division of the Regular Army to be moved about according to the caprice of the War Office and the fancies of Pall Mall. He could hardly believe that these proposals were seriously made after the experience of the South African War in which large numbers of Volunteers had served side by side with the best professional soldiers and had proved themselves perfectly capable of discharging their duty efficiently. When they remembered that an economy only amounting to £300,000—little more than one-third of the expenditure added to India by the increase of pay, little more than the amount added without any result in bounties to the Militia the year before last—when they realised also the enormous loss of power and patriotism, because it partook of both, only produced an economy of £300,000—he did not wish to say anything controversial, but it really did appear to him, that this part of the scheme was instinct with all the prejudices and jealousies of the professional and Regular soldier. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would carefully reconsider the whole position. He did not always agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, but he said something shortly after the war about the lessons of the war, which was profoundly true. He said the great lesson of the war was the immense power which could be developed by a citizen force in the defence of their own country. That was a wise counsel which ought not to be overlooked now.

He saw hon. Gentlemen opposite who took much interest in the Volunteers. He would even defend the inefficient Volunteer. He might be inefficient one year and perfectly efficient the next. Everybody who knew about Volunteer battalions knew that. It was not always the same lot of men who were inefficient. Anyhow, before they needed to employ the Volunteers in the Line against an invading army, or before sending them to fight across the sea, they would have time to give them sufficient training and to make them a very different force from what they were now. He was not going to trespass on the province that belonged to Volunteer officers. He would only urge upon the right hon. Gentleman that surely when the Regular Army was disorganised and could not be maintained, when it was subject to large reductions, when it was the subject of adventurous experiments of a character the end of which no man could foresee—surely this was not the time to lop off whole slices of the citizen force on which we had depended so much in the past.

The right hon. Gentleman could, of course, go on with his changes, which when made would not be easy to undo. He implored the right hon. Gentleman to content himself with doing one thing at a time. If the changes which he now proposed in the Army were successful—as they all hoped—then the right hon. Gentleman or his successor would be able to come to the House, and with added prestige and authority make proposals for the reconstitution of the Auxiliary Forces of the Crown. Some day when our system of local government should have got into a more complete condition, when, perhaps, there were provincial councils all over the country, he should look forward to seeing the Volunteers, the Militia, and the Yeomanry withdrawn altogether from the charge of the War Office, and their whole administration and control entrusted to local authorities. Then and then only would these citizen forces realise their full, proper, and natural development and strength. But that was not an idea that could be profitably or usefully discussed or even adumbrated by a private Member. At any rate they were entitled to appeal to the

Government not to compromise the whole future of these great citizen forces, not to revolutionise their character and position, and not in an hour of haste, after scanty consideration, to destroy organisations which had taken generations, and in some cases centuries, to grow.

The right hon. Gentleman had a right to have fair consideration for the proposals he had made. The Committee was desirous of according him that fair consideration, but at the same time he did not think he would get it. The hour had passed for Army reform for the moment. The whole current of events was flowing against the right hon. Gentleman. The unique opportunities which presented themselves three years ago, and the driving power that accompanied them would not soon be revived. A series of pretentious and sensational reforms following upon the immense disturbance after the war had irritated and exhausted the Army in every branch and every unit. This Parliament had a chance of becoming a great Army Reform Parliament and it had particularly failed in fulfilling that great opportunity. It could now only bequeath this question —as complex and difficult as that with which any Administration could be called upon to deal—to its successor with the difficulties aggravated and multiplied by the treatment it had given it. Nobody who knew anything about the Army could fail to recognise the courage with which the right hon. Gentleman had approached this great question, but it was not possible for any Secretary of State now to make any sudden retrenchment or improvement in the efficiency of the army system. Instead of advocating a Laodicean policy, he should say that the policy with regard to the British Army should be a policy of recuperation rather than of reform. Five years thrifty unostentatious administration was required before the real problem of a military system could again be approached with good hopes of arriving at a satisfactory result.

MR. LLEWELLYN (Somersetshire, N.) said he did not suppose that the hon. Member for Oldham expected the Committee to take seriously some of the remarks he had made. [AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!] He might remind the Committee that one of the remarks of the hon. Member was that he looked forward to the time when the Volunteers and Militia, and possibly also the Yeomanry, should be under the command of the chairmen of the parish councils. They could hardly be expected to take such a suggestion seriously. It had been stated that the members of the Norfolk Commission entered upon their work with preconceived ideas in favour of conscription. He wished to point out that the word conscription did not appear in the recommendations of the Committee except for the purpose of condemning it. The Commission sat for more than twelve months, and they exhausted every means in their power of avoiding the proposal of conscription. So far from their minds having been made up in favour of it at the beginning of their inquiries, the reverse was the case. The recommendation they made was arrived at with the greatest possible reluctance, and anybody who took the trouble to read the Report of the Commission would see that they recommended compulsory training after all other suggestions had been exhausted. Reference had been made to the shortcomings of the Militia regiments in the field. He would not go through the list which had been given to the Committee, but he wished to state that what occurred to him when the shortcomings were being stated was that it was not the fault of the men that they had not the training and equipment which they should have had. It was not even the fault of the system altogether. It was the fault of those gentlemen who did not understand the Militia, but who thought they did.

He was very glad that in the scheme which his right hon. friend had put before the country the recommendations of the Royal Commission had not been altogether put aside. There were many points in the scheme of the Secretary of State which were of the greatest value and which would be altogether absent if it had been of a revolutionary or hopeless character. To begin with, he recognised the value of the adoption of a territorial system. The right hon. Gentleman recognised that important consideration, and he congratulated him on the prominence he had given to them. The chief causes of the failure of the Militia and the Volunteer services were attributable to one cause in particular, viz., want of appreciation by those who had the management of affairs in the past of the real circumstances of the case; and want of power and of connection between those who administered in Pall Mall and the commanding officers who had the management either of the regiments in the case of the Militia or the corps and battalions in the case of the Volunteers. There was a class of men now in the Volunteers, which was being enlarged day by day, which originally were not in the Volunteers but in the Militia. The natural tendency, therefore, was to demand an increased capitation grant for the Volunteers, because they could not make for themselves the necessary provision to fit them for a soldier's life. The result was that the Militia was being injured by taking away the very class which ought to belong to it, while the Volunteers were injured because a certain number of their very best men were attracted to join the Yeomanry, in which corps they were paid 5s. a day besides a very handsome allowance for their horses. He did not blame the Yeomanry for taking them at all, for they were excellent fellows; but it was a pity that they should have left the Volunteers and that their places should be taken by more or less inferior men.

The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War said that he was going to cut down the Militia regiments because they were not fit for war. He did not know how the right hon. Gentleman was going to arrive at what regiments were fit or not fit for war. The numerical test was hardly a fair one. Circumstances had altered in the last twenty years. Some of the young men born and bred in the country did not stay there. They went into the towns where there were more attractions in the way of amusements, and enlisted and spent their money there. Now, these very countrymen were drafted into regiments not connected with the counties in which they were born. He thought that something might be done in regard to the alteration of the area of recruiting. Some Militia regiments where there was a thick population were of over-strength and as a rule these were under-officered, and other regiments were short of men and full of officers. If possible, he should like to see the boys of one county sent for enlistment to their own county and put into the regiment to which they ought properly to belong. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War said something which rather alarmed him—viz., that he did not think it would be possible for Militia officers to take command in the field.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that that was a mistake. What he had said was that if the recommendation of the hon. Gentleman's Commission were carried out, the Militia officers would have to spend seven months of the year in training and that he thought some officers could not give that time.

MR. LLEWELLYN said he did not think that that was conclusive. He understood the right hon. Gentleman did not look forward to any Militia officers having the command of their regiments in the field. He knew that there were to be found a great number of them who were absolutely fit to command their regiments in the field; and it would be a great deterrent to the appointment of such gentlemen if they were told that under no circumstances they should have the command of their regiments in the field. The idea had too long prevailed that the present system had produced no great disaster to this country, and that we had better muddle on. But that was a very dangerous principle to act on; and whatever faults were to be found with the present system, they should not be allowed to continue. We were a nation of grumblers, and he had been told that there were a great number of men who were perfectly content to remain grumblers and willing to take no steps to remedy faults of details.

He had no intention of speaking on behalf of his brother officers in the Militia, but he should like to remind those who had not taken the trouble to read the evidence put before the Commission of the opinion of those who were asked their advice, in view of the possibility of the invasion of this country, as to what changes were requisite in order that the Militia should be maintained in a condition of efficiency and strength. They were told that invasion was possible, as had been proved by events in the Far East under the new system of sea transport. If we were secure from invasion by the protection of our Fleet, what was the use of their sitting there and voting this money? This was not a matter to be smiled at. Did hon. and right hon. Gentlemen imagine that the conclusion to which the Commission came in regard to this matter was the conclusion simply of the eleven gentlemen who sat on that Commission? He could assure them that it was nothing of the sort; and they could satisfy themselves on that point by reading the evidence. That it was absolutely necessary that all our young men of proper age should be properly trained was not the view of these eleven members of the Commission alone, but of Lord Grenfell, General French, Sir Evelyn Wood, Lord Roberts, the Duke of Connaught, Sir Ian Hamilton, General Kelly-Kenny, and a score more.

Would hon. Members consider for a moment the possibilities under which this force might be required? They were told by the Prime Minister that probably the defence of the country might be left to the Militia, Volunteers and Yeomanry. That question had been asked of the Committee of Defence, and they were told that probably these forces would be required to act because there might be few Regular troops in this country at the decisive moment. They ought to remember what took place a short time ago. In the last year and a half of the South African War this country was denuded of every Regular unit; at any rate there was hardly a Regular unit which was up to its full strength. In fact, the Government was blamed for sending out all the Regular troops that could be mobilised and all the Militia. They sent out men who were practically worthless and paid them 5s. a day. That was at a time when we were at profound peace with Continental countries and when our Fleet was free on the seas. Was it necessary for anyone to sound a word of warning as to the possibility or probability of their having to depend upon the Militia, Volunteers, and Yeomanry, for the defence of these shores in other circumstances, when they had an instance of that kind before their minds? This country would not contemplate the possibility of a change until the occasion arose. What would be the occasion that would arise? No one knew. They were told that if the defence of the country required it, every Volunteer would shoulder his rifle. His own opinion was that he had better keep it at his shoulder because it was the safest place for it. What was the good of numbers, when many of the Volunteers were physically unfit, and many of them could not find time to carry out their duties. It had been said that the Report of the Commission was embarrassing to the Government; but the duty of the Commissioners was not to make a Report which would popularise the Militia and the Volunteers, but to issue a Report on the evidence which had been taken. There was not a single member of the Commission who would not sign that Report again and underline every word of it.

A great many people spoke of the necessity of a home Army in order to prevent a raid; but what were the facts. The Militia establishment was 32,000 men short, and if they included soldiers under nineteen, they were 43,000 short. The Volunteers were 78,000 short, and that did not include the Volunteers under twenty. The difficulty with which the hon. right Gentleman and the Commission had to contend with in this matter had reference to the want of efficiency on the part of the officers and to the number of the men. The right hon. Gentleman went a long way to remedy both; and he believed that under the right hon. Gentleman's scheme a class of officer would be obtained in the Militia which would be of the greatest value to the country. There were a number of men who would gladly make it practically their profession, and who would be perfectly willing to fit themselves for the work by attending classes. Certainly all the officers needed for the reserve battalions could be readily found; and they would be able to carry out all the duties required of them. As to the number of men, that was a greater difficulty; and he was afraid that, with regard to the Militia, the number required would not be found as easily as the right hon. Gentlemen imagined. The shrinkage at the present moment was something alarming. Why it should be thought that men should join the Line under the new conditions he could not imagine.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that more men from the Militia than were required went into the Line at present.

Mr. LLEWELLYN said the circumstances were entirely different. As a rule a young man went into the Militia before he joined the Line to see what soldiering was like; but the regular Militiaman joined the Militia for the reason that he liked soldiering. He apologised to the House for the length at which he had spoken, but his mind was very full of the topic. There was one matter to which he should wish to be allowed to refer. This House and the War Office had been blamed for the shrinkage in the Army; but there was also blame to be apportioned to the public. The public did not appreciate the soldiers in time of peace. It was all very well to get up subscriptions in time of war; but soldiers wanted more than that. They wanted the possibility of insults being poured upon them removed. The other day, he was in command of a Militia battalion in training, and a person in his own district said to him, "Oh, the Militia are coming and we will have no vegetables in our garden, or eggs in our fowlhouse." It would be difficult for him to say in the House what his reply was, but he would state that during the period the men were under training there was not a single case of larceny or drunkenness, and there was no case of misconduct even brought before him as commanding officer. He would give another instance. He had listened to many sermons preached to soldiers, and he did not think he had ever heard a parson, except a military chaplain, who did not address the soldiers as if they were inferior to the rest of the congregation; and as if they were open to temptations that they ought to guard against more than others. These were the sort of insults of which he complained. He was glad to know that now twenty-three out of every thirty-five soldiers who had served their period obtained suitable civil employment. That, he thought, would to a great extent remedy the difficulty with regard to recruiting. An hon. Gentleman opposite said that they on the Commission went into it with their minds made up in favour of conscription. That was not so. They only found it out after the most careful investigation; though he himself would always regret that he belonged to a country which had to be defended, not by voluntary effort, but by compulsory service.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had carried the Committee with him more in the details than in the actual lines of his speech. Sermons such as the hon. Gentleman described were by no means peculiar to the Army. They had been addressed to every man who, as a boy, had ever attended a school or college; and he was not sure if sermons were preached in the House of Commons nowadays, as they were in the Cromwellian times, that they should not be addressed in a similar manner, though not by their present chaplain. The hon. Gentleman seemed to think that hon. Members on that side smiled at his doctrin s; but they did not smile at him, but with him, especially when he admitted that the Admiralty and the War Office contradicted one another in the evidence which was given before the Commission. If this country were in a position to spend hundreds of millions of pounds sterling on the Army and Navy, it might well protect itself against invasion. But the country was spending too much already; and, therefore, it was that they had to pick and choose the essential from the non-essential. The Volunteers, however, gave the country an assurance against panic, and also provided it with a great number of men who would be of use abroad in the event of war.

There were a number of other subjects of great importance which it was now necessary to discuss; and he should like to turn the attention of the Committee to one or two which had not yet been mentioned. The Secretary of State spoke of the endorsement of his plans by the House. This was the 8th of August. That was the dominant factor in the debate. At such a period of the session it was impossible that there should be either approbation or disapprobation of such a kind as to commit the House on the Government scheme. The scheme would have to go forward on the sole responsibility of the Administration. The criticism against the scheme had been, the Secretary of State said local and special on particular heads, but as regarded the Regular Forces of the country the responsibility would rest with the Government alone, and there would be no responsibility on the part of the House of Commons. The responsibility which the Government sought to make the House share with them was an illusory responsibility. What the Committee must do under the circumstances, was to accept the scheme on the responsibility of the Administration, the House being uncommitted to the scheme, and regarding it solely as the scheme of the Administration. Whilst he differed from the Prime Minister on the fact that the approbation of the main scheme would be shown by the passing of this Vote, he cordially agreed with the Secretary of State for War to-day in thinking that this problem was urgent. He could not agree with the hon. Member for Oldham and the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex in thinking that the whole thing could be postponed. There were 1,000 reasons why it could not be. The question of the drafts for India alone made it extremely urgent. That question must be met by steps on the part of the Administration, and the Secretary of State for War was bound to act in the direction of his Liverpool speech and to see that the plans which he carried out should be such that any successors of his should not find their hands tied, especially with regard to any reduction. It was sufficient to allege the ground of finance alone in support of the doctrine.

The hon. Member for Oldham had assumed that under this scheme there would be a reduction of £2,500,000 on the Estimates. He had looked carefully through the figures but he could find no such reduction, and unless the scheme were carried further, he doubted whether it was possible to keep the promises of substantial reduction which Ministers had made. The words used in the statement of the Secretary of State for War, circulated to the House, went to show that there was to be a reduction at once, sufficient to reduce the Estimates of last year over the present year owing to the fact that the Estimates of the present year were £1,000,000 under what they would have been owing to the surplus from the war. Then there was the fact that the Estimates of next year must be swelled by the cost of a number of quick-firing guns. There were many things reported on by the War Commission which would cost money, and which were, as some thought, essential. Was the saving on this scheme sufficient? Speaking as one in favour of the main lines of the scheme, he must admit that it turned the Army upside down; and the question was whether such a revolution ought not to be accompanied by a much larger reduction, if only to guard against too hasty demands for reduction in the Navy. Ought we not to do this on a larger scale, and secure that the reduction should be so large that there could not be any danger of that kind. As to the details of the contemplated reduction, the information was very vague. What battalions were to be withdrawn from abroad beyond the garrison battalions?

* **MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER**: The suggestion is that eleven battalions are to be withdrawn, leaving twenty-six. The fact that some of them will be the garrison battalions about to be abolished does not affect the calculation. In future we hope to reduce the colonial battalions to twenty-six, the garrison battalions being replaced by battalions of the Line.

* **SIR CHARLES DILKE** said that it was difficult to see where these troops could be withdrawn from, except South Africa. It was impossible to touch those in Malta and Gibraltar, and he doubted the policy of withdrawing the white troops altogether from Egypt.

As to the Militia part of the scheme, which was an essential portion of the Army scheme in the mind of the Secretary of State, but which was a portion as to which he had not the slightest idea how this House could express the opinion which they had been invited to express, he agreed that the Militia had been most unjustly abused in the Report of the War Commission for deficiencies not their own. He confessed he thought that the Militia might have been gradually improved, have been revivified rather than destroyed. The Secretary of State had said he would deal with the question of short training and the question of the Swiss army system later. He had not done so. He (Sir Charles Dilke) did not share the view of the impossibility of creating a decent force out of the Militia, which was held by many of the advisers of the Government. He was one of those who would have made the Militia liable to service abroad in time of war, and tried gradually to improve the system, looking to it to create a home Army with which the Reserves would drill. The Government were not quite consistent on this matter, because, while they sought to enforce the words of the Royal Commission that our Militia was not fit to meet foreign troops, and that the Swiss army was not efficient, that was not the opinion of the military experts of our time. If we were to endorse those views the Government were somewhat inconsistent, he thought, in telling us, in one breath, that we ought not to spend money on troops which were incapable of facing foreign armies, and, at the same time, asking us to spend money on rifle clubs and on persons at home who were not even organised. The Government were not quite consistent on this subject, and the Government could not expect the Committee to endorse their view, which might tend to make the Militia die away.

There had been a great controversy as to whether the new scheme would give us, not only the reliefs for India, but a sufficient Army for despatch across the seas in time of war. He was sorry that the problem of the British Empire in war should have been complicated by what, he thought, was a new heresy, the idea of sending virtually all the Army to India. It was a curious thing that the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex, who made so fierce an attack on some portions of the Government scheme, adopted exactly the same heresy. The Prime Minister told the House the other day that the problem was the defence, not of the north-west frontier of India but of Afghanistan, and the noble Lord had told them what was true, that Russia had improved her communications towards the north-west frontier of Afghanistan. But that was 420 miles from the Indian frontier. No one could contemplate our placing an army in Afghanistan, unless at the request of the Ameer, who would probably prefer to be responsible for the defence of his own frontiers; but even if we did, that Army would have to march 420 miles across some of the most difficult and dangerous country in the world to get at Russia. Would 100,000 Regular troops organised upon a European system at home, in addition to the Indian forces, be easily transported across 420 miles? The whole thing was a dream, and he was sorry to hear the noble Lord the Member for Ealing accept all this as if it had been admitted and proved. The necessities of the Indian Government in the future might become very different from what they were at present, but they had nevertheless to deal with the present situation and they had to keep the situation for the next few years in view. The dangers of an Empire like ours changed continually and they might have an entirely different condition of affairs in a few years time. He admitted that the Indian problem must always be kept in mind. He admitted the necessity of keeping a formidable force for this purpose, but he hoped that in this matter they would not have exclusive regard to the needs of India, and that this force should be as free and as little tied or ear-marked to any particular service as possible. He agreed with the financial argument of the noble Lord in regard to India. The Government alleged this supposed necessity two years ago, and it was a little difficult to turn round now and tell India that that argument was all moonshine.

There was another point upon which the Government had not perhaps been quite frank with the House, and it bore upon the question of expenditure. Expenditure had forced this scheme upon the House and they had made these proposals in the hope of effecting a reduction in the expenditure. In trying to save money, however, the Government should be most careful not to put aside expenditure which was even more necessary than the expenditure upon rifle clubs and many other matters upon which expenditure was now proposed. He had heard with some alarm Answers given to Questions which rather suggested that the

Government were not so keenly alive as some of them would like to the necessity of re-arming our artillery with quick-firing guns. He thought the House believed that the decision to re-arm the Indian Army with the quick-firing gun first was resolved upon owing to purely financial reasons. The doctrine of the Government was that they must not spend money upon anything which could not face the best European army. Could the British Army face a European army without quick-firing guns? An important statement had been made on this point on behalf of the Government of India in the recent debate in the Governor-General's Council, where The Military Member of the Council used these words—

> "Are we to disregard all warnings and remain in a backward state of military preparation? The South African War showed the inferiority of our field gun, and since then experiments have been carried out to produce a perfect gun of quick-firing type. It is interesting to know how backward we are. Russia is armed with a quick-firing gun firing sixteen rounds a minute; ours probably fires two with difficulty. France is also armed with quick-firing guns stated to fire twenty rounds a minute. Germany has been armed since 1896 but is now re-arming with a better one. Even Switzerland began re-arming in 1901 and Japan commenced in that year, and is believed to have completed its Field Artillery with quick-firing guns."

That was an official statement made on behalf of the Government of India, and in the face of that fact, was it not obvious that in regard to one of the first necessities of modern warfare our Army stood in a position of hopeless inferiority. That was a state of things they could not allow to continue. The reductions in expenditure under this scheme would not be so large as those which the House of Commons and the country had a right to expect. When they were turning a system upside down, upon principles which he supported, he thought they ought to have seen a much larger reduction as the result of that change. It had been said that under this new system the home battalions would fall into a condition of hopeless inferiority. Had the French army or the Prussian army fallen into this position? Did his hon. friend mean to say that these armies did not possess a real military spirit? He thought these were old-fashioned arguments. The question which could be addressed to the Committee at this moment was — Did this scheme show that large reduction in expenditure which was the true ground and initiation of the scheme, and which, he thought, the country would demand?

Sir Charles Dilke.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said he did not propose to enter into any of the details of the interesting and instructive discussion in which the Committee had been engaged. His object in rising was to disclaim, not only for himself, but for the majority of Members on both sides of the House, any sort of responsibility in passing this scheme here. He would tell the Committee in two or three sentences why. In the first place, as the right hon. Gentleman himself admitted, it was a vague and experimental scheme; and in the second place, according to his own confession, it was an incomplete scheme. They did not know up to this moment what was going to happen to the Militia, or how far the proposals which the right hon. Gentleman had in the back of his mind would in the course of the next few months be gradually carried into execution. They were entirely ignorant up to now how far and in what degree this scheme represented the united opinion and settled judgment of His Majesty's Government; further still they did know that it had little or no relevancy to the Army Estimates which they were at present engaged in discussing; and finally, though perhaps this was the most conclusive argument of all, this 8th of August was actually the first opportunity they had had of discussing the details of this scheme; it was absurd, in view of all these considerations, to think that the Vote to-night could be taken as anything like an approval of the scheme. While he recognised the reforming zeal of the Secretary of State, and while so far as he was personally concerned he admitted that there were matters in the scheme which had his hearty sympathy, he protested strongly that when they passed the salary of the Secretary of State their vote was not to be construed, and could not be fairly understood, as an expression of the fair judgment of the House of Commons on the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman.

Sir J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N. E.) said that he was very unwilling to intervene in the debate, but he had risen more than once with the intention of making some remarks on the same lines as those which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife. He felt that in the discussion of the scheme of the Secretary of State for War they were in a false position. They were now going to vote on the Army Estimates of the present year, but the scheme which had been foreshadowed with more precision than on former occasions that day, had no reference to the Estimates of the present year. It had reference to the question of Army reform in the future, and they did not even know how many points of the scheme of the Secretary of State had the approval of the Cabinet. They did not know that the scheme as a whole was even the scheme of His Majesty's Government. In fact, the Secretary of State for War was reported to have said in another place that the scheme must not be accepted as embodying the final resolutions of the Government. Under those circumstances it was absolutely impossible, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife had said, that in the vote given that night the House could express approval either in whole or in detail of the scheme to which they had listened with such great interest. He thought it would be well not to deprecate the proposals of the Secretary of State, looked upon as a whole. He knew well for years past how great had been the interest and how very useful the researches the Secretary of State for War had made into Army as well as Navy questions. At the same time he was greatly impressed by what had already been said in the course of the discussion concerning the far-reaching and disastrous effects that might follow the failure of his scheme. If they took the Army to pieces and then failed to put it together again, the last stage would be worse than the first. He was very doubtful whether the position of the Army was anything like so desperate as to require such drastic changes. Undoubtedly some changes were required. Experiments had been tried, and not unsuccessfully, but he was by no means persuaded that the system of the Secretary of State for India, which secured the assent of the House, was not beginning really to bear fruit. There had been an improvement in the position of the Guards which was much more valuable than the enlisting of recruits, and this he believed to be the result of the increased pay obtained for them by the Secretary for India, and which only came into operation last year. What they wanted in regard to the Army was a little fixity of tenure, and not to have considerable changes which would unsettle their minds. It was a very serious thing to fill the Army so largely with men who did not extend their service. When soldiers went to India they found the service there pleasant and they became reconciled to it. The result was that the Secretary of State for War told him the other day that in the last six months 42 or 43 per cent. of the men entitled to longer service in India had extended their time. That showed that the present system was not so bad. They did not know what part of this scheme had been accepted by the Cabinet: and they would not know until the Estimates were presented next year, and that was, he thought, a most dangerous position.

He had been deeply impressed with the branch of the subject, which had been very strongly enforced by his hon. and gallant friend beside him, which proposed the abolition of the Militia. Of the existing Militia battalions, one-half were to be abolished altogether, and the other half were to be doubled up to one-fourth of their present number, who were to be adjuncts of the new home Army. This was an enormous change. It meant doing away with a force which for hundreds of years had been the constitutional force of the country, and in time of stress had not been found wanting in assisting the Army. It was the abuse of the Militia which had brought it to its present disastrous condition. It was inevitable if the Militia was to be used as a kind of forcing-house for the Line that it could not remain in a satisfactory position. He knew what the Militia was twenty or thirty years ago, but it had been constantly squeezed to make up the deficiency in the recruiting for the Army, and it was no wonder that a state of affairs had been reached when it was deemed undesirable to retain it. Any vote which was given that night must not be taken as an expression that the House was a consenting party in favour of such a tremendous change. Undoubtedly some of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals were excellent. Service Members had long urged the necessity of having a striking force at Aldershot, and the Boer War would probably have been prevented if we had possessed such a force which could be sent abroad without mobilising the Army. Another excellent proposal was that to form larger depots where recruits could be efficiently trained, and he was quite sure that if his right hon. friend would not want to do too much at once he would leave the Army much stronger than he found it. He hoped his right hon. friend would not expect them to consent to this scheme as a whole without letting them know how much of it the Cabinet approved.

*MR. C. R. SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid.) said it was rather pleasant to hear from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War that the Volunteer force was to be taken seriously, and to be treated accordingly. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on that change of attitude towards that force. The right hon. Gentleman had announced a scheme of reduction and concentration. As to reduction, he regretted that the right hon. Gentleman thought it necessary. He might say to the right hon. Gentleman that he could not understand his scheme in its entirety, and he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman a Question in regard to one point. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to a differentiation between Volunteers. Now, he did not, himself, see how there could be a difference between Volunteers without raising considerable friction and dissatisfaction. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that this had already been done in some regiments; but he should like to hear more about it before he would consent to such differentiation. He could not help feeling that it would produce much disagreeableness which they did not want in the Volunteer regiments of the country. There was another point. The right hon. Gentleman should consider that there was a difference between country and town Volunteer regiments. If the right hon. Gentleman had served, as he had done, in a country regiment, he would have seen that it was almost impossible to enforce on the country regiments the same regulations as could easily be fulfilled by the town battalions. They had a right to ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider these points when he was introducing such fundamental changes as he had sketched out. Some remarks had been made, he was glad to say, not in the House, as to the uselessness of the Volunteers. He confessed he had been somewhat annoyed at hearing a soldier—whose name he would not give—say "Oh! What is the good of the Volunteers?" He humbly suggested that the Volunteers had not done badly in South Africa. They had sent very good men there who had distinguished themselves. There was another point. He hoped the present Secretary for War, and successive Secretaries for War, would show a little more sympathetic feeling in regard to the administration of the Volunteer force, starting on the premise that they were Volunteers, and that they required consideration and help. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see that the Volunteer force, though not as good as the Regulars, could be of use to the country and ought to be supported by this House.

*SIR LEES KNOWLES said he understood that his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War had abandoned the idea of differentiating as between efficients and non-efficients in Volunteer battalions. If, however, the Volunteers were to be reduced, they should be given some consideration from the pecuniary point of view, in the shape of a larger grant, according to their efficiency. At present a Volunteer battalion received a *per capita* allowance, which perhaps might induce the officers to think more of numbers than of efficiency; but if the numbers were to be reduced, a greater grant should be given to them. They had been told by a colleague of his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War that this scheme did not represent the final opinion of the Government. If that were so, he would ask his right hon. friend to pause with regard to one or two matters. He wished to refer especially to the proposed reduction of the Line battalions. They had been discussing that afternoon the possibility of invasion. That such a possibility existed, he would support by a statement of Lord Wolseley before the Royal Commission. Lord Wolseley said, "I take into consideration most fully all our Navy can do to protect us from invasion in my calculations: I will content myself with the remark that Napoleon and Wellington, Nelson and Collingwood, believed in the possibility, indeed, I might say, the feasibility of invasion. If I err in believing in that danger, I err in skilled company." When the present Government came into office in 1900 they promised a reform of the War office and of the Army, and augmentations were made of the infantry, etc. Lord Wolseley added certain battalions, and he estimated that to resist invasion the country required 100,000 Regulars, 50,000 Militia, and 100,000 of the best Volunteers. In that he was supported by other military authorities, such as Lord Roberts, Sir Evelyn Wood, Generals Kelly-Kenny, Nicholson and others. Only last year the Prime Minister stated that the country wanted a much larger force than was proposed under the present scheme, and he was supported by the War Commission. The late Mr. Stanhope proposed a striking force of 20,000 men. The striking force in this scheme was only 16,000 men. The points he wished to emphasise, however, had reference to the infantry battalions, in which he was specially interested, because two of the regiments to be reduced were Lancashire regiments, the Manchester Regiment and the Lancashire Fusiliers. They were augmented recently, and, at the time, they were regarded as permanent institutions. The Guards, the cavalry and the Militia appeared to be outside this scheme of reduction, and, no doubt, to some extent that was due to social influence. He wished to point out the hardship to the officers in the battalions that would be disbanded. 378 officers must be absorbed in other battalions in consequence of this disbanding, in addition to 350 from 50 battalions, the officers of which were to be reduced from 27 to 20. That would be very hard on the present generation of officers. To a large number of them it would mean professional extinction, and, to the majority, it would mean an increase of service abroad unless the foreign-service Army was reduced. It might be said that in any scheme of organisation, reconstruction, or retrenchment, individuals would have to suffer. That was all very well; but the hardship of the battalions he had mentioned was that they were being disbanded within a few years of having been raised and the labour and expense entailed would be lost. The officers of these battalions had not gained accelerated promotion, because of the introduction of officers from other regiments; and after incurring the expense of new uniforms they would have to incur further expense on joining another regiment. There was also the expenditure in providing the mess for the new battalions, which they need not have incurred had they joined an old battalion. It was bad for the Army, and bad for the Empire that, just at the end of a war, soldiers who had served their country well should be the first to suffer. To his mind, the scheme was revolutionary; and, if it were to be introduced at all, it should be introduced slowly and cautiously, and the details should be carefully scrutinised.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [21st Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

£331,000, War Office, Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges.

*Sir **LEES KNOWLES**, continuing his speech, said when the Committee adjourned he was trying to induce the

Secretary of State not to disband but to reduce the Line battalions. It required at least two years' hard work to make a soldier, and the trouble was that the greater number of those who enlisted did not like hard work, they enlisted to get food and petty cash, and if they were made to work they at once said they could get more wages in civil life with less restrictions. The scheme went below the irreducible minimum both in numbers and period of service. Ancient and modern authorities alike held that three years was the shortest period in which to make a soldier efficient, and it seemed to him that the Reservists with two years service and two training, would be little better than efficient Volunteers. In times of stress it was far easier to fill existing battalions than to raise new ones, and he was borne out in that statement by the remark of the Secretary of State in one of his opening sentences, that he would rather have ten men on whom he could rely than 100 raised rapidly under the stress of adversity. He was further borne out by the statement of his friend Colonel Bruxner-Randall, of the Lancashire Fusiliers, who wrote to him—

> "While I see the difficulty of getting men, still, my experience proves that a regiment is easier to expand from 500 to 1,000 than to originate. I had two entire companies from our 1st Battalion to start the new 3rd Battalion. Even up to a year after the formation those two old companies kept their lead; and this superiority was not the result of better officers."

And then he went on to say—

> "In fact, these companies were alive, and drafts of recruits were digested by them. The new companies were made up of just as good material, but were atoms with no corporate life: And this fault took much time and cultivation to eradicate."

He could speak, moreover, from personal experience of the excellence of the 4th Battalion, the Lancashire Fusiliers, which it was proposed to disband. One third of the figures recently quoted of those who volunteered for long service in India came from that battalion, and, to shew the excellent men they had in that battalion, at the recent All-Ireland Rifle Meeting at the Curragh, fifty-four of the warrant officers, non-commissioned officers and men won fifty-four individual prizes, amounting to £68. Further, for the Scouts' cup—the blue ribbon of the meeting—their sections took first, second, and third places, the second and third being ties. The high state of efficiency of this battalion under Colonel Hammersley, and now under Colonel Deane, was well known to the general officers under whom it had served, and it was only last year that he himself at the Curragh saw its colours presented to it by the Duke of Connaught. He could illustrate from history how the reduction of units impaired in time of necessity the power of expansion in the case of the 20th Regiment. In 1756, owing to stress of war with France, a second battalion was raised. This subsequently became the 67th regiment. In 1779, again in consequence of war with France, an expansion was necessary, and he 20th Regiment received a draft of Militiamen, and the corps was formed into two battalions which served together in Holland and Egypt. In 1858, the stress of the Crimea, followed by the Mutiny, necessitated expansion and the present second battalion was raised. In all these three cases a new battalion was raised hurriedly for war, and the existing battalion was in each case denuded to supply the new staff and nucleus for the new battalion. What he asked was this, was it necessary to do more than reduce the number of men in each battalion? He suggested that if skeleton battalions were kept that would meet the necessities of the case, and that instead of having battalions of 1,000 men the right hon. Gentleman might have battalions of 500, which were easy to handle, and this, he believed, was the custom in European armies.

With regard to the territorial system, he was personally much attached to it. He should not be speaking to-night if he were not second in command of a Volunteer battalion of the Lancashire Fusiliers. He looked upon the territorial system as one of great value, and he always noticed the names of men in his own battalion who had passed into the Militia or into the Line. He looked on the territorial system as a sort of family connection. The territorial system was carried not merely into the Army but into the Navy: our battleships now being named after counties. Everybody was now accustomed to territorial names, and a county name gave a wider importance to a regiment and a homely and sentimental attachment. The men of the Lancashire regiments were nearly all Lancashire men, men from the county although perhaps not recruited in their own districts, but in different districts. But the men did not cease to belong to the county because their battalion was not quartered in it. With regard to the linked-battalion system, he liked the idea of one battalion feeding another, and although the right hon. Gentleman disapproved of that system, he might point out that Lord Wolseley described it as the only safe one. He considered it was useful when the battalion at home had sent men to its sister battalion abroad, and it strengthened the strong family feeling. They saw that in the active service corps which were sent to South Africa; the three Volunteer battalions of the Lancashire Fusiliers sent out three active service companies to South Africa, and splendid reports came home from the officers commanding. They were bound together by a common feeling of *camaraderie*, the living together under one canvas, and *esprit de corps*. He would refer to the farewells to these companies in the recent edition of the History of the Lancashire Fusiliers by Major B. Smyth, M.V.O., of the Royal Hibernian Military School. With regard to the Line battalions to which he had referred, he would ask for special consideration for them; he would ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider the advisability of reducing rather than disbanding them. This scheme had been introduced at the fag end of the session, and he thought some little further time should be given to its consideration. He hoped nothing drastic would be done during the recess. He wished the right hon. Gentleman all success in his scheme, but hoped that he would not be hard on those for whom he (Sir Lees Knowles) now pleaded.

*CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said that much that had been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, and by Members on both sides of the House, went to show that, so far as Army reform was concerned, the Government was condemned. They had been eight years in office, and had been dealing with Army reform for the last five years. He would not do the right hon. Gentleman the injustice of supposing that this was the right hon. Gentleman's own scheme. This scheme had been evolved out of the general knowledge of the Cabinet. He might describe it as a Forster, Brodrick, Wyndham, and Balfour scheme. It was nothing but a shuffling compromise to tide over the difficulty for the day and leave the question of Army reform in a state of confusion worse confounded; it had been whittled away to meet the exigencies of the day. The Committee had been told that this scheme was backed by the united Cabinet, but they were told the same thing with regard to the previous scheme, which was to give us two Army Corps, but which, when it came to war, gave one Army Corps, and what the Scotch called a bittock. The scheme which followed it, which introduced the three years men, was condemned by all military authorities, who warned the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor that the men would not re-engage. He had no desire to attach more importance to the military authorities, who sometimes disagreed, but there were some questions upon which they could give information, and this was one. Those who had been connected with the men all their lives were able to say whether they would re-engage or not. The result of that scheme was that it was a failure. What he would like to know was whether this scheme of the united Cabinet had the backing of half-a-dozen generals of experience who had the confidence of the Army and the country. If the right hon. Gentleman could say that, then the scheme would occupy a different position to what he (Captain Norton) thought it did at the present moment.

The whole of the right hon. Gentleman's scheme was economy and efficiency. In regard to economy, the right hon. Gentleman showed a decrease of a million odd, but if they took into consideration the fact that India was paying for the manufacture of guns this year, and that we were living, so to speak, on the stores left over from the South African War; that the money payments would be steadily increasing; that we had to meet the difficulty of

Indian reliefs, and that we had not yet paid for Somaliland—if all those matters were taken into consideration—not only would the million which the right hon. Gentleman professed to have saved be wiped out, but a million or two more. He also contended that the reduction of our fighting force was out of all proportion to the economy gained. The right hon. Gentleman placed at least half the battalions of the country on a peace footing, and left us with a balance of 177,000 men, which meant that our total force was reduced by about one-sixth, and such a reduction of men should represent £5,000,000 instead of £1,000,000. We were, therefore, paying too dearly for the small economy obtained.

He was astonished to hear the right hon. Gentleman make the statement he did with regard to conscription. The right hon. Gentleman said that were conscription possible it would be costly! Why, the very reverse was the case. Why did Continental nations adopt it? The Members of the other House had no constituents to face and they did not hesitate to tell the country the truth, nor did the Royal Commission. It was an unpalatable truth, no doubt, but it required to be told. To pretend that conscription was not the most economical way of getting an Army—at the same time we should get the flower of the country in the Army—was not playing the straightforward game. The right hon. Gentleman stated the cost would be £26,000,000 on the assumption that the number of men raised each year would be 380,000. But why in the name of heaven should he want 380,000 men when the right hon. Gentleman maintained that under his scheme he would provide for the garrisons and the defence of the country with 214,000 regular troops *minus* his reduction of 37,000? He (Captain Norton) had been at some trouble to get out the figures that would apply to an Army of this size if obtained by conscription, and the cost of 177,000 men would be £12,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the non-commissioned officers would be paid Army rates, and then he would have to provide 1s. a day for the men; but the right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that in countries where the Army was obtained by conscription, where the people were bound to serve, they were paid practically nothing. This meant a further reduction of at least £3,000,000, consequently the cost would be only £9,000,000. Therefore it was not fair to the country to lead them to believe that if this country was prepared to do that which Switzerland and other countries did, it would be more costly. The great difficulty we had to deal with was the question of recruiting. It might be said, in dealing with this liability of the manhood of this country to some form of service, that we might lose from an industrial point of view; but the opposite was the case. It had been found by the insurance companies of Berlin that the men who had given their time to the service of the country lasted five years longer than those who had not been through the service. The result, therefore would be a gain of three years of industrial life. It was not fair to place this question before the country in any but its true light.

One specific and definite Question he would like to put to the right hon. Gentleman. When was the new scheme with regard to recruiting to come into force? As to recruiting, the total number required for the home and general-service Armies was 34,500. In a normal year the country would provide about 40,000 recruits, of whom a large proportion were below the proper standard of physique. The alteration in the terms of enlistment really constituted a new gamble in recruiting. There was no reason to believe that men would come forward for foreign service any more readily for nine years than for seven or eight years, because not only was nothing additional offered, but the men were to be taken at a higher age, and were to be physically sound. The physical condition of recruits had a distinct bearing on the question. A high authority had computed that during the last decade 60 per cent. of the men who presented themselves for enlistment were rejected, and that of the men accepted 37·6 per cent. were either rejected within three months of enlistment or were discharged for inefficiency in two years. A larger number than usual had been cast for various diseases during the last nine years, and in Manchester alone no fewer than 49 per cent. of the men presenting themselves had been refused. If the right hon. Gentleman took 34,500 recruits, he would have difficulty in getting 20,000 of the class he required from them, which was not much over half the number he wanted. This matter of recruiting was the basis of the whole question. As his view was borne out by two high military authorities whom he had consulted, he thought the right hon. Gentleman was hardly justified in throwing so much cold water on the scheme suggested by the Royal Commission.

The Militia, he believed, had much to complain of. The cause of the depletion of the Militia was the abominable manner in which it had been treated. It had been squeezed absolutely dry. It gave 2,000 officers and 54,000 men to the Regulars during the late war, it sent seventy battalions to South Africa and the Mediterranean, and now that the force had been ruined hard things were said about it. So far as the Volunteers were concerned, he believed the result of this amputation would be to cause a shock to the constitution of the Volunteer force as a whole. The division into two classes would create friction in every corps throughout the country. What the members of the force required was sympathy and consideration in reference to their ordinary avocations, whereas under the proposed scheme many of the very best men would be crushed out of the force. Of the 448,000 men who soldiered in South Africa, 200,000 came from the Auxiliary Forces, and the Volunteers alone supplied 20,000. He therefore thought it would be a fatal mistake to destroy the units in the manner proposed.

So far as the broad outlines of the scheme were concerned, he was thoroughly with the right hon. Gentleman, but he would venture to suggest one or two remedies for certain difficulties which would be encountered. A considerable reduction in the Regular Army might be effected if the coaling stations were handed over to the Admiralty, who could man them much more effectively and at the cost of far fewer men. Then it was monstrous that this country should be called upon to furnish 21,500 men for South Africa at an expenditure of £1,360,000 more than they would cost to maintain in this country. There was no more unpopular station than South Africa. The soldiers there had none of the amenities which they enjoyed in England, they were stationed at great distances from towns; liquor of all sorts was excessively dear; and the men had to discharge duties for which they received only one-third of the pay given to other people to do the same class of work. The British soldiers had had enough of South Africa. Why should not that country do the same as Ireland, which not only supported its own constabulary but bore its share of the cost of the Army? As to the long-service Army for India, there was no reason why the right hon. Gentleman should not get the men he required if he would give them 6d. a day deferred pay, so that they would get a pension after fifteen years service, increasing in amount the longer they were able to serve as effective soldiers. Recruiting at home would doubtless be assisted if a certain number of men of good character were allowed to sleep out of barracks. From the point of view of the physique of the manhood of the country, nothing was more desirable than that physical exercises should be taught in the public schools.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Not on the Army Estimates,

*Captain NORTON agreed. He was simply throwing out the suggestion as one which would improve the physique of the youth of the country. The right hon. Gentleman would also be assisted in the getting of recruits if he would take boys as they were taken in the Navy, so that on reaching manhood they should be bound for twelve years. The life of the soldier in India would be made more comfortable if he was quartered more than at present in the hills. With regard to the Volunteers, if something like £12 instead of £9 were given the force would be largely increased, and in time of need could be drawn upon for a large proportion of men of fine physique, who in a very short time would be able to take their place in the field.

Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent Tunbridge) congratulated the Opposition on possessing so eloquent and able an advocate of the policy of compulsory service as the hon. Member for West Newington had just proved himself to be. Having always felt that we should eventually be driven to some such system to enable the necessary men to be obtained, he had listened with pleasure to the speech of the hon. Member, and he had never heard the reasons in favour of conscription more clearly stated. But his purpose in rising was to refer to that branch of the service with which he was connected, viz., the Militia. There was so much that was good in the general scheme of the Secretary of State that all Army reformers must wish him well in the great work he had undertaken, but he could not say that the right hon. Gentleman's proposals with regard to the Militia were sound, good, or likely to be to the advantage of the Army or the country. The Militia had not been treated fairly in the matter. If the force was absolutely inefficient, by all means let the right hon. Gentleman say so and let it be abolished. But what the right hon. Gentleman said was, "I am going to maintain and improve you; I am going to boil you down to thirty-three battalions; I am going to put you in a better position." As a matter of fact, under the scheme the existing force might be boiled down to thirty-three home-service battalions; in that sense its identity would be preserved, but it would not be preserved as Militia. The conditions of service would be so different that the country would not get the Militia, but something altogether changed. Instead of getting officers who joined their county Militia because they liked to serve in a battalion with which possibly their family had been connected for generations, they would get a force consisting of ten so-called Militia officers, not belonging to the regiment which they regarded as their own, but attached to a regiment merely for a month's training, and coming in a position of inferiority to the officers who served all the year round. The actual effect of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals would be to abolish the Militia and increase the Line battalions. That might be a good or a bad scheme, but he had always understood that the great use of the Militia was that they were able to go out in time of emergency as complete units. In the South African War Lord Roberts was enabled to send to the front a tremendously powerful force, and to place in the fighting line practically the whole British Army, simply because the Line battalions had been freed from garrison duty in England, to a large extent in the Mediterranean, nd also on the lines of communication, by the embodiment of nearly 100 battalions of Militia which were able to go out as units. In addition to that the Line battalions in nearly every case drew largely from the Militia and the Militia Reserves. We hoped never again to be confronted with so great a national emergency, but it might happen, and then where would the regiments come from to garrison the forts at home, in the Mediterranean, and to play the part which the Militia played in the South African War? The Militia had always stood behind the Line. It might not have been a very glorious part, but it had been a most useful part, and the country would be running a grave risk if they got rid of that force, which in every national emergency had done its duty and enabled the Line to do its duty far more effectively than it could otherwise have done.

The Militia were told that they were to be transformed out of recognition because they were inefficient. He thought the Report of the Royal Commission dealt very hardly with the Militia. Nobody ever suggested that Militia battalions which had trained for only one month should, before they had been embodied for some weeks, be sent abroad to meet a foreign foe. They were a large force of willing officers and men, ready to do their best, and who, after three or four months embodiment, rapidly became thoroughly efficient. They had received very hard treatment at the hands of the War Office, their best officers had been taken away, and they had had most restricted opportunities of learning their work. Let there be a large reduction of the Militia establishment to bring it down to recruiting capabilities, let the Militia have encouragement from the War Office which it never had, let there be more training and field exercise, and, with compulsory musketry practice in addition, the force would be as useful as it had been in the past.

He had confined his criticisms to the particular proposals of the Secretary of State for War, but he did not think it was right that hon. Members should confine themselves to criticism and make no suggestions in regard to remedies. He understood that the proposals of his right hon. friend had not really received the sanction of His Majesty's Government, and that they had only been put forward for discussion. There were three things which they might do with regard to the Militia. In the first place, they might leave it as it was; secondly, they might adopt the plan of his right hon. friend which involved transformation out of all recognition; and in the third place they might reduce the establishment. The Militia establishment at the present moment was a ridiculous one, and bore no relation in the different districts to the recruiting capabilities of those districts. In some places they had eight companies where it was impossible to raise more than four; whilst in some other districts the establishment was exceeded. He would suggest first of all a large reduction in the establishment of the Militia. Let the establishment be cut down to what could really be got in the way of recruits. He would suggest that they might amalgamate many of the districts, and reduce the existing number of battalions to sixty or seventy of 600 or 700 men each. The Militia should be treated less as the feeding-bottle of the Line and more as a force to be maintained on its own account. The present system of training was much too short. He did not see why every Militiaman should not be compelled to do his musketry training at the nearest range on so many days each year, so that the whole of his month's annual training could be utilised for field exercise and drill. He thought that would go a long way towards improving the efficiency of the Militia. He agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that the Militia should be enlisted for foreign as well as for home service, and he did not think there would be any difficulty at all about it. If some such proposals as he had suggested were carried out, he believed that they had in the Militia the making of a smaller but a thoroughly efficient body. He thought they were all agreed that any vote which they might give that evening did not imply that they gave their sanction to the scheme. Before any of these changes were made in the Militia he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the whole of this question and consult the Militia officers generally; and he was sure that they would be only too glad to co-operate with the right hon. Gentleman in any scheme which, although it might involve the reduction of their numbers, meant increasing the efficiency of the force. He firmly believed that anything which tended towards the abolition of the Militia would meet with great opposition in the country.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that whilst exception had been taken to almost every suggestion contained in these proposals there had been a feeling that the intention of the Secretary for War was so obviously sincere in desiring to do something for the good of the Army that his proposals had been treated with greater moderation and leniency than if they had emanated from some other person sitting on the Treasury Bench. The hon. Member for Manchester had suggested that the Committee should place upon record its formal approval of the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman. These proposals carried them back to the suggestions made by the Secretary of State for India three years ago. His scheme suggested the introduction of garrison battalions, but the Secretary for War now proposed to do away with them. The Secretary for India mapped out six Army Corps, but the Secretary for War now proposed to do away with the Army Corps districts and to substitute administrative districts. The Secretary for India created 35,000 Imperial Yeomanry, whilst the Secretary for War had largely reduced that number. If the Committee contrasted the proposals made by the Secretary for India and those now put forward by the Secretary for War they would find that they were diametrically opposed to each other and it was impossible to reconcile one with the other. Unless he had an assurance that the passing of this Vote would not be construed into approval of the proposals of the Secretary for War, he should move the reduction of which he had given notice. The Secretary of State for War told them that none of his colleagues desired these changes to be made. That meant that the Army Council, either in its entirety or by a majority, were against the proposals. The right hon. Gentleman had not been able to cite one single military colleague as acquiescing or giving his authority to the scheme he laid before the House. That was an important point which ought not to be overlooked. He hoped the Secretary for War would give them some information upon this point, to which he attached considerable importance. The Secretary for India told them three years ago that his proposal for a general three years enlistment was "a leap in the dark." He wished to know if the proposal for a nine years enlistment for general service in the Army was any the less "a leap in the dark." What assurance had they got that the results so far as recruiting was concerned would be any the less strange than had resulted from the proposals which they discussed some time ago? He did not wish to labour the point with reference to what had been called "plague spots" in the Army. That was an expression which might very well have been used from the Opposition side of the House, but it was very extraordinary that at the end of the tenure of office by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India the Secretary for War should refer to the condition of the Army in such a pessimistic way.

The right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that the two mentors upon which he had framed his indictment were the South African War and the Report of the Commission. He wished to remind the Committee that it was not the system of the Army that existed previous to 1899 which broke down in South Africa, but our failure was due to the fact that the Government had deliberately made no preparations previous to the war. They might have been perfectly right from a political point of view, but from a military point of view it was certain that they were absolutely wrong, and we had to pay the penalty for neglecting a precaution which he did not think any other nation would have ventured to indulge in. The Report of the Commission showed, in the first place, that many departments of the Army were served excellently and had exhibited great powers of organisation and development. In the second place the Report showed that the numbers produced by the old system were unexpectedly large; and thirdly that the training was deplorably deficient. In every proposal for the reorganisation of the Army it was essential to remember two things. One was the provision of the necessary numbers, and the other the training of the soldiers. Ever since the right hon. Gentleman's proposals had been before the country he himself had made it his business to ask the opinion and advice of every section of the Army, soldier, officer, non-commissioned officer, Volunteer and Militiaman on the proposals of the Secretary of State, and he found a universal agreement that if the Army were left alone to choose, they would almost universally go back to the seven and five years which obtained previous to 1902. He did not know whether the Committee were familiar with the result of that system. In the year ending April, 1899, the seven and five years system produced 40,207 recruits, of whom 11 per cent. deserted during the first year. In the year ending April, 1903, which was the first year of the new system, there were 40,339 recruits, of whom 12 per cent. deserted. During the year ending April, 1904, which was the last year of the new system, there were 42,216 recruits and the percentage of desertions was unobtainable. Therefore the old system with lower pay and with worse food and clothing produced within a fraction the same results as the shorter system which was more costly.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): But 30 per cent. were "specials" under the old system.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said the right hon. Gentleman was not distinguished for rejecting "specials" when they suited his purpose. He would remind the Committee that the physical standard was lowered to meet the exigencies of the war, and it had not yet been restored to the old standard. Under the old system the actual number of men serving with the colours was very significant. On the 1st of October, 1899, there were with the colours 59,000 men, of whom 16,000 had done over five years service, 28,000 had done over two years service, and 15,000 under two years service. Of these 25,000 could, if the organisation had been better, have been shipped off to South Africa within a day or two of the declaration of war. All that was wanted was better organisation and mobilisation, but the right hon. Gentleman was now interfering with the supply of the men which had proved adequate to our needs.

What would the new proposals produce? The estimate was twenty-six battalions with an average of 800 per battalion, and ten Guards battalions with 800 men each, producing a total of 28,800 men. Not a single man of that total could be moved unless the Reserves were mobilised. The right hon. Gentleman had made much of the fact that this was to be a striking force, but it was no such thing. The thirty-eight home-service battalions would produce at 500 men each 19,000, and that would give a total of only 47,800 men with the colours on the outbreak of the war. The moral of all these figures was that they got not only less in numbers but also a much lower quality of men with the colours than they had before. With regard to the Reserves the old system on the 1st October, 1899, produced 51,000 infantry, and 6,500 cavalry with an average of something like eight years service. He had left out of this calculation the Guards. These Reserves were of the finest quality, and every general who commanded them spoke in their praise, and they were rightly regarded as the backbone of the service. If they added to those 51,000 Reservists 11,000 Militia Reserves then they got a total of 62,000 men under the old system. The Secretary for War had put the total number of men going from the general-service Army to the Reserve at 23,000, but in the Memorandum issued the other day that number had been corrected to 20,300. They got on an average something like 11,000 recruits yearly, and if every single man passed into the Reserve they would only get 33,000 at the end of that time. On 17th December, 1902, in answer to a Question, the Secretary for India told them that in regard to the men who came into the Army and subsequently went into the Reserve there was a wastage of something like 60 per cent. Taking 33,000 as the possible number of Reserves, at 60 per cent. wastage the number would be brought down to 13,200 as going to the Reserves. The home-service Army of the right hon. Gentleman was to be entirely served, so far as non-commissioned officers were concerned, by men from the long-service Army, and he calculated that he wanted 2,000 a year, or a total of 6,000 for the three years. Therefore that 13,200 had now been brought down to about 7,000. The right hon. Gentleman suggested for the home-service Reserves thirty-eight battalions at 500 men each, giving a 100 each for long service, and sending 200 yearly to the Reserve. That gave a total of 45,600 for the six years, and if they deducted 10 per cent for wastage the total was brought down to 41,000. The net result was that under the old system we got 59,000 men with the colours on the outbreak of war, and 62,000 Reserves, whereas under the new system we only got 47,000 men with the colours and 47,600 Reserves. All they were going to gain by the new system was an infinitesimal reduction in the expense, which upon the most favourable estimate would not amount to more than £1,000,000, and for this they were going to sacrifice this great reserve strength.

The Secretary for War had stated that the constant calling up of the Reserves interfered with civil employment. Let them consider how many times in the course of the last generation the Reserve had been called up. They were instituted in 1870, and they were called up for the first time in 1882, and then only 10,000 were called up. They were called up for the second time in 1885 and then only to the extent of 2,000. The last occasion was in 1899, when practically the whole of the Reserves were called up. Therefore it was suggested that they were going to create a very expensive and so-called striking force because it was alleged that the calling up of the Reserve had frequently interfered with civil employment. What was to be the number of the striking force? It was fixed at 15,000 or 16,000 men, but he thought the Committee would be surprised to learn that only four times for thirty-five years had an expeditionary force of over 3,000 quitted these shores. On each of those four occasions it was enormously over the 15,000 men set down by the right hon. Gentleman. What was the moral of that? Surely it was that for a serious expedition a force of 15,000 was too few, and for a punitive expedition too large. What we ought to have was a comparatively small striking force, and behind them there should stand as at the present moment a small special Reserve to come up on occasions of this sort. If that were done we would get rid of the proposed make-believe expeditionary force which could not leave these shores without mobilising the Reserves. A careful and unbiassed examination of the figures of the right hon. Gentleman would show that most of them would not hold water. He begged the right hon. Gentleman before the debate closed to tell the Committee seriously what was the opinion of the Army Council on the subject, whether he could quote any military authority of experience and importance in support of his proposal, and whether it was not the case that, with the best intentions in the world, he was imposing on this Committee and the country proposals which had received no sanction from any military authority whatever.

*COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle) said he desired to compliment the Secretary of State for War on the great care he had bestowed upon the proposals he had laid before the House. He for one should have been most happy to have supported those proposals in their entirety had it been possible for him to do so, but there were some points he was unable to endorse. He would endeavour in the remarks he had to make to point out the proposals in the scheme which seemed to him not to meet our military necessities. From the speeches which had been made it seemed to be considered that the proposals in regard to the Militia were the weakest in the scheme. Speaking as a Militia commanding officer and also as a former Line officer with many years experience, he thought the remarks made by previous speakers on the Militia were perfectly correct, and he thoroughly endorsed them. He would remind the Committee that the Militia was the old constitutional force of this country, that it dated from the time of King Alfred, and that there was a Militia force in existence before there was any Regular Army at all. Under the present scheme, as he understood it, the idea was to forget this and practically to turn the Militia into a force which would be an entirely different kind of force, to put it in a new guise, in which its old county constitution was to assume an entirely new phase. He admitted that the Militia at the present time was not altogether satisfactory, but he left it to the Committee to judge whether by changing the character of the force they were likely to induce men to engage in it under entirely new conditions of organisation. Military reformers at the present time did not seem to carry their minds back beyond the South African War. The services of the Militia in that war were on a par with those which they rendered in previous notable campaigns. A large number of the Duke of Wellington's forces at the battle of Waterloo were composed of the Militia. Great caution should be observed in changing the character of a force which had such ancient and honourable traditions, and which had rendered such great services. But while retaining its present form, it should be possible to strengthen the Militia and to develop its usefulness as the second or supporting force of our Regular Army. He had never considered that one month's training was sufficient to enable the force to perform thoroughly the duties it might be called upon to perform, but at the same time he was bound to say that if seven months training were substituted for this that it would seriously reduce the number of men in the force. The services of the Militia were well known in the country, and in passing from the subject he would only say that no encomium from him was required in that respect, but he wished that the Militia was more appreciated and better treated by the War Office than it had been in the past.

There was one remark of the Secretary of State for War to which he wished to refer. The right hon. Gentleman said that whatever system was followed there must be some uncertainty as to the ultimate course to be taken in regard to changes in the Army. That was a phrase which, he thought, the Committee might consider with advantage. It was suggested that we should take an entirely new departure, that we should to a certain extent blot out the broad lines of demarcation between our Military Forces accepted in the past, and take a leap in the dark in regard to the organisation of the future. They ought, if possible, to look for experience to the military past of the Army in order to obtain success in organisation in the future. The counsel which he would offer for the consideration of the Committee might be held to be retrograde, but it ought, nevertheless, to be seriously considered. It was that, having tried a particular course for the last thirty years of short service and Reserves, and that course having entirely failed to meet our military requirements, we should go back to the parting of the ways, where the initial mistake was made, and endeavour to some extent to recreate our Army organisation on the basis on which it was constituted when its military history was the most glorious in the annals of the country. The point in connection with that suggestion was this. Our great difficulty then, as now, was, that we could not get sufficient recruits. It had always been a difficulty in our Army. But in order to get recruits we must adopt a system of service satisfactory to the recruit-giving class, and what we had now to look into was the reason why that class no longer supplied the men we wanted for the Army. He did not mean to say that in the days of long service the recruiting was what it should have been. A Commission sat in 1866 and reported that the system of recruiting was at that time a hand-to-mouth one. We were still in that hand-to-mouth position now, and short service had done nothing to mend it, but in the old days we had men with our battalions, while in these days we had only boys, and when war broke out we had to leave a large percentage of them at home, because they were unfit for service. One reason why we suffered so much from the want of proper men was that the confidence of the recruit-giving class in Army administration had been entirely destroyed by the incessant change of the conditions of service, and when they had grown to know their work they were sent adrift into the Reserves to forget it all. The course he suggested to the right hon. Gentleman was that we should go back to a measure of long service—that a man should be enlisted for at least five years, and that at the end of two years the men who were not likely to make good soldiers should be dismissed from the service. After that the men should be allowed to enlist for a longer period, say ten years, and after that, 50 per cent. of men physically fit and with good characters should be allowed to serve on for pension after 21 years. Short service had been shown not to meet our military needs. The right hon. Gentleman had proposed that the Army should consist of two branches—a long-service Army, and a short-service Army. He took entire exception to that proposal. There was no necessity for these two branches if the Army was constituted on a proper system, and the proper system was that the linked-battalion system should be entirely swept away, and the system of single battalion regiments with real depots be adopted instead of it. He was sorry to notice that the right hon. Gentleman in his scheme did not propose entirely to do away with the linked-battalion system, but to retain the *cadres* for purposes of exchange of officers, and this seemed to be unnecessary and confusing. But in any change now made let our battalions be strong and able to take the field, and let each battalion or unit have its depot at home from which recruits could come as in the past. We did not want large Reserves, but we did want strong battalions filled with well-trained men for our Regular Army, and in reserve a good second force to support them. That Force should be the Militia Force strengthened and improved by all the means at our disposal.

Mr. GUEST (Plymouth) said he desired to dissociate himself from any formal approval of the scheme of the Secretary of State for War as put before them tonight and on previous occasions. Having listened to this and previous debates in this House he was inclined to think that the Secretary of State would have to use his persuasive and whatever didactic powers he might possess on his own side before appealing to hon. Members on the Opposition side to support his scheme. On the general problems of the Army he found himself in general agreement with the Secretary of State. In listening to the

Secretary of State he felt that they were emerging from the dark ages of militarism and that they had the advantage of assisting at the renaissance of common sense in Army Questions. It would not be sufficient for the right hon. Gentleman to effect an improvement as compared with those dark ages. The standard by which his success or failure would be judged would be that of the classical period which preceded those dark ages, and therefore he thought the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised if he looked back to the time which he would call the Cardwell era not only for comparison, but also for a system on which he might find a sure foundation for his reform. What were the objects which the Secretary of State had in view. They were, to his mind, efficiency, economy, a small Army at home, and a system under which Reservists did not enter civil occupation, feeling themselves liable to be called upon on slight provocation to leave that occupation and rejoin their regiments. Although the scheme provided for improvements under these heads, there was also a great deal to be said as to where the scheme failed, and that it could not be regarded as an ideal reform. Whatever efficiency might be attained under the scheme, the battalions abroad as compared with the battalions existing to-day would be smaller than they were. There was a reduction in the numerical strength. Another respect in which the scheme seemed to fail was in the Reserve of the general-service Army. The Reserve was extremely small, and without being a military expert, he should say inadequate. An objection to the home-service Army, so far as efficiency was concerned, was that the battalions the right hon. Gentleman sought to create could not possess the number of companies which all military authorities considered necessary to the efficient training of battalions.

What about the question of economy? All previous speakers in that debate had lamented that while making such great changes the Secretary of State for War had only been able to effect a very small economy. There was reason to suppose that the economy which was shown in the Paper circulated by him was more apparent than real, and its principal effect was to prevent the natural growth of expenditure under the system we were now suffering from very nearly to the extent to which he claimed to reduce the cost of the Army. The economy that he held out to them, small as it was, was dependent on his ability to reduce the eleven battalions, he supposed, from South Africa. What he wished to know was whether the Secretary of State for War would be able to effect that reduction, and when would he be able to do it. He might hope to be able to reduce them, but he had not indicated to the House how and in what respect he would be able to withdraw them, nor had that step received the approval of the House. With regard to the small home Army, he quite admitted that, so far as the general-service Army was concerned, there was a considerable reduction of the troops to be kept in this country, but the balance was very much against reducing the Army at home, because the Secretary of State was adding to it thirty-three short-service battalions. As to the Reserve, there were to be only 179 to each battalion. That was not a very large allowance, and he felt perfectly certain that when the day of trial came the Reserve would be really in no better position than at present. The mere fact of the reduction of the unit to a figure below the mobilised strength exposed the Reserve to a greater demand than if the units were kept up to strength.

The problem, however, resolved itself into a question of recruiting. What reason was there to anticipate that the recruits necessary for the scheme would be obtained? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would explain in his reply why he was sanguine of obtaining the necessary recruits. He would require 33,000 or 34,000 recruits every year, and very much better recruits than were now being obtained. Nearly half of them were to be over nineteen years of age, and 57 per cent. over eighteen years, and the right hon. Gentleman knew very well that in past years many recruits under eighteen had been taken. When two alternatives were offered to recruits, the one to sign on for nine years and the other to sign on for two years with the possibility of extending, it was very likely that the number who would from the beginning enlist for the longer period would be very much less than the Secretary of State expected. The whole scheme, great as might be its advantages, had given the impression in the House and the country of being stillborn. He agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that had it effected an economy of four or five millions it might have succeeded, but it was a serious disadvantage that it proposed to turn the whole Army upside down for a paltry saving of not more than a million. In view of the errors of the past six or seven years he thought they should revert to the Cardwellian system, making whatever modifications and reforms were necessary to bring it up to date. That system produced an Army within 18,000 of the number which the right hon. Gentleman proposed, at a cost of £10,000,000 less. It had produced an Army which enabled us to conquer the Soudan and to send an Army to South Africa greater than ever known in our history. They should go back to that system which had produced such results. The right hon. Gentleman had made a mistake in trying to degrade the citizen Army; he should seek to encourage and improve it. If the right hon. Gentleman were to regularise the Militia instead of territorialising it, he would obtain better results without sacrificing patriotism. With a smaller Regular Army he would have plenty of money to enable him to secure greater efficiency in the Auxiliary Forces.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that a more varied battery of criticism had never been directed against any Minister and from so many different points than had been opened upon him that evening. He should do his best in the circumstances to reply. He ought to begin by replying to his noble friend the Member for Ealing, because some remarks that his noble friend made would have been in his judgment of great importance if they had been borne out by the facts. His noble friend who had been Secretary for India for a great many years very naturally and rightly took up the case of India and pronounced a censure upon him which would have been just if the figures on which it was based had been quite correct. His noble friend said we were asking India to undergo a large expense on the faith of receiving a contribution in the shape of a large Reserve, and that we were now withholding from her the Reserve which we had contracted to provide for her. That was an error. The actual Reserve at the present time was 80,000. It must be remembered that the Reserve at present was naturally depleted on account of the late war. The calculated Reserve under the existing system was 121,000. The Reserve calculated under the system which he proposed was 128,000. Therefore, so far from giving India smaller value for her money, India would be furnished with greater value for her money than she had yet received. The noble Lord paid great attention to a point which he seemed to consider very effective. That was that the Army was being cut into two sections—those who would stay at home and those who would go abroad. The noble Lord went on to say that the stars, medals, and decorations would be given to those who went abroad, and withheld from those who stayed at home, and asked how, if they gave no inducements to the men who stayed at home, they hoped to get recruits for the home-service battalions. But that seemed to him to embody a double fallacy. What the noble Lord objected to was precisely the state of things which existed now. The noble Lord also said that all the brains would go abroad. But what about the Brigade of Guards? He did not think all the brainless people went into it. On the contrary, his impression was that it was rather the other way, and he thought it would be able to hold its own with any infantry in the Army. Besides, within a recent date there were six very distinguished cavalry regiments whose privilege it was to remain at home except in time of war. But really the fears of the noble Lord were somewhat fanciful. In all these respects exactly the same things would happen in the future as were happening now. Men and officers who wanted to serve abroad would serve abroad, and the men and officers who wanted to serve at home would serve at home. The picture drawn by the noble Lord of battalions enduring penal servitude in India was equally fanciful. Service in India was not so regarded in the Army. The term of service in India for nearly every man who extended now was seven or eight years. He hoped if his proposals were adopted that the term would be much less. Besides, the total number of battalions serving abroad under his system would be less than it was now.

A point of great importance had been raised by the noble Lord and others, though he was surprised they should suppose that this importance did not strike him also. Hon. Members had spoken of the question of recruiting, and had asked him whether he had ever considered whether it would be possible to raise 14,000 recruits for general service for nine years. He should like the Committee to consider the real meaning of that criticism. He had this year to find 24,000 men in drafts for India and the Colonies—12,000 men in drafts for India, and the whole of these ought to be men who were serving for seven or eight years. Were the Government proposing any extension of the demand for recruits? On the contrary, they were asking for far fewer recruits. They were asking for 14,000 directly enlisted men to go abroad. The present period of service was eight years; they were asking them to go for nine. A very large proportion of the men who were serving in India at this moment were serving nine, ten, eleven, and even twelve years. They were not asking for more, but less; they were simply opening another door for the recruit to enter in at. At present every recruit, whatever his age and qualifications might be, must engage to serve three years and three only, and at the end of two years he had the option of extending for seven or eight years, as the case might be. During his two years he only got 1s. 5d. a day; that was not the pay of the general-service soldier, but of the short-service soldier. They were diminishing the number of recruits required, and offering to any man who desired the right to extend his service, not after two years, but after six months. If they did not, under the present system of recruiting, get extensions to the full limit they required for India and the Colonies, to that extent their recruiting failed. They were giving greater attractions of pay, and they hoped they should be able to give greater attractions in employment after men had left the service. But it was an entire delusion to suppose that they were imposing any new liability on the recruits by asking them to come forward for general service. No one knew what the recruiting market would produce, but it was fair to predict that if they got ten recruits at, say a shilling rate, they would get five at a rate of 1s. 6d. The power of extension would be just as much open, and they would have added to it the opportunity to soldiers who had reached the age of nineteen, of whom there were far more than the number they required, to get their full service pay at once if they chose to go on foreign service. His noble friend, who had spoken of the quality of the battalions they would send out to India, was under a misapprehension. Could we now find 114 battalions, all a thousand strong, of trained long-service men and employ them in any part of the Empire? Certainly not. When the Army was last mobilised many thousands of men were left behind for whom there was no unit, no officers, no organisation. He had no hesitation in saying that were we able in the event of war to face that war with 114 battalions of long-service soldiers, including the Guards, and with seventy-one battalions of soldiers, all of whom would have had from one year's training and upwards, we should be in a much better military position than we were when we had tens of thousands of soldiers who were left behind on account of their physical immaturity and because there was no organisation for them.

The noble Lord made recommendations with regard to the defence of our coaling stations, and he welcomed him as an ally in what he believed to be a most desirable reform. He entirely sympathised with him, and his only regret was that the noble Lord was not successful, when he held office, in inducing the Government to take that view. He believed the noble Lord was quite right in thinking, in spite of what the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean said, that the prevailing Continental precedent might be followed with advantage in this country, and that we might relieve our troops to a very great extent from a duty which, he thought, was not congenial, and which seemed to him a duty which they could not perform with precisely the same efficiency as those who were acquainted with all the varieties of craft that were at sea, with the difference between friend and foe, and all the peculiarities of work done on the salt water.

The right hon. Baronet the Member for Walsall talked about the question of recruiting, but he thought that in what he said he was under a misapprehension. Their present difficulty was not with the recruiting; it was with the retention of the men who had entered the service. Recruiting, so far from falling off, was in excess of any recruiting which had been hitherto known. The right hon. Gentleman was, he thought, a little astray, too, in thinking that these men were not likely to respond to an inducement of 1s. 5d. a day. He was rather sorry the right hon. Gentleman said that, because he wanted it to be very widely known that that sum did not represent the pay of the private soldier, and that any soldier on an extended engagement was now entitled to receive pay amounting to 1s. 11d. a day, which, with a very small amount of efficiency in rifle shooting, would amount to 2s. a day. And when they took into consideration the other emoluments he received—the fact that he was well fed and housed, that he was doctored, and that he was provided for in many ways—he was in receipt of a total income which, he believed, compared well with that of many skilled artisans in this country.

The right hon. Gentleman made certain recommendations, which he assured him he welcomed, as to future additional economies. He proposed one with regard to the Guards, but there again he thought the right hon. Gentleman was under a misapprehension, because if he would look at the figures of recruiting for the Guards he would find that, though the number of battalions had increased, the total number of men in the Guards had decreased. Therefore a reduction of the battalions would mean a reduction so much larger than he thought the right hon. Gentleman contemplated, that probably in these circumstances he would hesitate to recommend it. He did not say that circumstances might not make it desirable to consolidate the Guards battalions, but he did not think any one would recommend a reduction in the rank and file of the Guards. He thought the right hon. Gentleman did not remember that the establishment of the Guards had been greatly reduced, and the result was that the number of men in individual battalions was very much less than it was at the time of which he was speaking. The result of a reduction would be, not merely to diminish the number of battalions, but greatly to reduce the strength of the Brigade of Guards from what it was before the ttalions were added.

The garrison in Egypt was a political matter into which he did not feel disposed to enter. He should be very glad, from the War Office point of view, to withdraw certain battalions from Egypt, and that, no doubt, would give them a reduction of expenditure. He did not agree with the suggestion that the Yeomanry might be reduced with advantage. He thought we got about as good value from the Yeomanry as from any branch of the service at the present time. It was perfectly true that the expenditure had gone up per head, and had gone up in excess of the number of men, but he was bound to say that he thought the Yeomanry of to-day was a far more efficient force than was the Yeomanry of the time of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Walsall spoke, when the cost per head was much smaller than it was now.

With regard to what the hon. Member for Oldham had said with respect to the length of foreign service, unless his anticipations were much belied, the soldier would spend less time in India than he did at the present time. The hon. Member for Oldham would see on reflection that a soldier would hardly ever spend the whole of his time in India, especially when they remembered that it would be possible, and it was their intention, to move a battalion, as a battalion, from one quarter to another.

The hon. Member for Tunbridge spoke about the force with which he had such a distinguished and honourable connection—the Militia. He hoped he had made it clear that it was his desire and hope to enable the Militia to continue to give the valuable service that it had hitherto rendered, and even more valuable service. The hon. Member's battalion was an example of what might be done by the application of the principle of concentration coupled with efficiency, because, if he remembered rightly, the battalion of which the hon. Member was an officer, was an example of two battalions which were unable to support an independent existence, but which by concentration had obtained greater efficiency. Therefore, he regarded the hon. Member and his battalion as allies rather than as opponents in this matter.

An hon. Member seemed to associate him with the opinion that the Volunteers were a negligible factor, and not one to be regarded with sympathy by the War Office. He certainly thought that he had committed himself as deeply as any one in his position could do to the opinion that the Volunteer force contained within it the most valuable military material that we possessed. He adhered to his opinion that there was a large amount of redundant material in the Volunteers, but side by side with that material there was some of the finest military material that we possessed. When it was borne in mind that it was part of his proposal to give larger funds to those Volunteers whom they desired to maintain he did not think there was much to complain of. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had referred to the Swiss Militia. He knew it was an excellent force, but he was reluctant to assume that there was any analogy between the Swiss Militia and our Militia. The Swiss Militia was the conscript and only force of probably one of the best educated nations in Europe. It was charged with the defence of a country whose geographical circumstances were unique in Europe. He would, however, point out that never since the battle of Sempach had Switzerland, despite its geographical features, ever been held against an invading army—the invading army had passed through Switzerland like a hot knife through butter. Although he was the first to recognise the excellence of the Swiss Militia, if any one told him that our Militia battalions as they were now, or as they were likely to be in any forecast they could reasonably make, were the analogue of the Swiss Militia, then he must respectfully contradict him. Moreover, he ventured to believe that there was not a single member of the Swiss War Office—and they were very capable officers—who would pretend that he could take the Swiss Militia, organised as it was, and put it into the field against a foreign army out of its own country; still less that he would send it to fight battles in a country across the sea. That was our problem—it was not the Swiss problem: whether with a conscript army or a volunteer army, efficiency could only be obtained by thorough training. Those who had read the interesting story of the 93rd Highlanders by the late Sir John Ewart in his "Story of a Soldier's Life," would recognise to what a state of efficiency a battalion could be brought, organised, and led by its own officers, and would understand that it was a work of months or years. We deceived ourselves if we thought we could fight the manhood of a great nation with anything less than the manhood and education of our own. Therefore, he was sceptical when he heard it suggested that we could rely on men selected as our Militia were and trained for a month.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife disclaimed all responsibility for what might be done by the War Office, and he was not surprised. Since he had had anything to do with the administration of the Army he had not found it easy to get anyone to take responsibility. He felt himself that this responsibility must be assumed by some one. The days in which we lived were critical days, and from his own knowledge he believed—he did not know if he had succeeded in imparting that belief to others—that this was the time when we must be doing something. He had put before the House over and over again what he thought to be the evils the Army was suffering from, and he did not believe there was a dissentient voice; there was practical agreement among officers and civilians. He had put before them the broad lines of his policy, a policy he had been able to collate from the wisdom of those who could give him the best advice on Army matters for remedying the evils, and they had agreed that the character of the Army must be altered, that expenditure must be reduced, that it must be an Army practically for service abroad, that the numbers at home must be diminished, that the quality of the troops on which we were to rely must be improved; and up to that point he might say there had been universal agreement. Then he in his position had to go a step further and to try to give practical effect to this unanimity of opinion. He had made the suggestions of which the Committee were well aware, and criticisms had been passed upon them; but he desired to call attention to the fact that, apart from small matters such as had been recommended by the right hon. Baronet, there had not been a single substantive suggestion during the whole course of the two days debate; not one single suggestion made of a scheme by which those radical defects he had described could be remedied. Therefore, though he did not desire to press upon hon. Members a greater responsibility than they wished to bear, he did, at any rate, ask that they would give to one who had the responsibility to bear the opportunity of trying to give effect—not to his own opinions, for they were unimportant—but to what he believed to be the opinion of those who had studied the problem of the defence of this country and which he had tried to carry out by the suggestions he had made.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that even after the explanation which had been given by the right hon. Gentleman, many of them on the Opposition side of the House did not believe that the Secretary for War would be able to get the number of recruits he required. That, of course, was a very important point as affecting the success of this scheme, because if the necessary number of recruits was not obtained they would not be able to undo the damage done to the Army by the various schemes of the last five or six years. Many of them believed that the war destroyed and absorbed the Reserve which existed for the time being. The scheme which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India introduced began to reinstate that Reserve, but in doing so the efficiency of the Regular Army was destroyed. Now they had a scheme put forward which might set the Regular Army right, but which would certainly destroy the present system of Reserves. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be satisfied with what he had got, without starting these thirty-three new battalions. When a great scheme of this kind was brought in it was most important that there should be a large reduction of expenditure. Instead of thirty-three new battalions he should suggest that ten would be ample. Certainly there ought to be a larger reduction in the expenditure than £1,000,000. He believed that the Militia would be destroyed by this scheme, but he was not going to press that point now. The right hon. Gentleman said he did not wish to maintain any troops which were not efficient. What about the artillery? The artillery were armed at present with a weapon that fired one shot as compared with eight fired by the guns of other European nations. It was all very well to say that next year something would be done, for they had been told the same thing for the last ten years, and they still remained in the same unsatisfactory position. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had pointed out that the artillery was now and would be next year armed in a distinctly inferior manner to all the civilised troops in the world, and they could not be put in the field against European troops without quick-firing guns. The Reserves had always been looked upon as their second line of defence when the first line was sent abroad, but apparently these new battalions would be sent to India, and there would be no second line to take their place. He thought this scheme was a tentative one which had been brought forward at a very bad time. The Army wanted to feel certain that there would be no further meddling with them, and they did not like this chopping and changing about. That was what they had suffered from during the last few years. He sincerely hoped that this scheme would be further curtailed, and that a larger economy would be carried out.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Wednesday; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

CUNARD AGREEMENT (MONEY) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.), in moving that the Bill be read a second time that day three months, said the Prime Minister had explained the object of the Bill as being to carry out an agreement into which the Government had entered. That was doubtless a correct description of the Bill, but if the matter were looked into it would be seen that it was hardly a satisfactory reason for accepting without scrutiny a measure with such far-reaching provisions. The Resolution upon which the Bill was based was passed in August last, but it was impossible for Parliament and the country to take in the essentials of so complicated an agreement from the short discussion which then took place. The Prime Minister had always been too fond of this hasty legislation. The Sugar Convention was another instance of the same sort of thing. It was the business of the House to study the terms of agreements into which the Government entered. The Bill was short, but the agreement itself was very far-reaching. Its object was to sanction a loan of £2,600,000 to a private company, the capital of which was not so large as the proposed loan, to enable the company to buy two ships for its own exclusive use. That was an extraordinary provision. Then the interest on the loan was to be 2¾ per cent. But the company could not borrow money at anything like that rate, and the Government itself would have to pay from 3 to 3½ per cent. Why should the Government pledge its credit and borrow money at a higher rate than it charged the company? Moreover, a huge annual subsidy, amounting to £250,000, was to be paid to the company, and whether the ships were lost at sea or captured the subsidy was still to be paid. In addition, the company were to receive a mail subsidy of £68,000 a year. A further provision gave the company a number of small pickings, and the whole of these onerous conditions were to be binding for twenty years. There were also other provisions enabling the Government to buy the ships at an extravagant price, and fixing the rates at which it could have the ships if necessary. The total amount of money to be paid to the company in the twenty years was no less than £6,966,000. He protested against the House being hustled into such an agreement, under which this large sum was to be paid for practically no services whatever.

Two Government Departments, the Admiralty and the Post Office, were involved in this agreement. He submitted, however, that if the agreement had been entered into for the defence of the country it should be dealt with by the Admiralty exclusively, while if it was a Post Office matter it should come up on the Post Office Estimates with the other mail contracts. The ships were to be capable of a speed of twenty-four and a half knots, but since the agreement the Government had arranged for the building of eight ships with a speed of twenty-five knots. What use, therefore, would these particular ships be? The eight scouts which the Government had arranged for would do the work much more effectively, and at less cost, and in a more regular way. That proved that the agreement had not been properly thought out. One of the most remarkable aspects of the case was that the ships were to trade not with our own Colonies but with a foreign country. Why should we pay this huge sum annually simply to establish a better service with the United States? The principle of the agreement was thoroughly unsound. The recent Subsidies Committee advised the Government to hesitate before giving any more of these naval subsidies, and the Admiralty, acting on that advice, had decided to abandon many of the subsidies they had hitherto paid. No satisfactory defence of this proposal had been made; the agreement bristled with onerous conditions; it would set an extremely bad precedent; and the least that could have been done was to have allowed more competition in the matter. He hoped that even at this late hour the House would reconsider the question. The Government having chosen to adopt an abnormal method of procedure, had no right to expect their difficulties to be considered for a moment, and the House should hold itself perfectly free to pronounce any decision it chose with regard to the merits of the agreement. He begged to move.

MR. MCKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.), in seconding the Amendment, said that, although the principle of the Bill had been discussed on two occasions after midnight, he had not yet heard a single good reason put forward on behalf of the Government to show why on its merits this measure should be passed. All the House had been told was that they had already assented to the principle, and that therefore they ought now to accept the measure. That was not a fair argument. The preliminary stage passed in August of last year did not in the least bind the House. The Cunard Company knew very well that the agreement could not be carried into effect until a Bill had been passed through Parliament; consequently they were fully aware that the preliminary Resolution was not in any way binding. The Government might very well say that they, as a Government, were bound to do their utmost to pass the Bill, but the House as apart from the Government were absolutely free to discuss the question on its merits, and if they came to the conclusion that the Government had made a blunder the best thing that could be done for the country was that they should refuse to sanction the agreement. It was idle to say that the £2,600,000 was to be repaid. The Government would indeed receive £165,000 per annum in the form of sinking fund and interest, but they had to pay a subsidy of £150,000, and the difference of £15,000 was more than made up by the excess of the rate of interest they would have to pay over the rate at which they would lend to the company. As a matter of fact, the country would be £2,600,000 to the bad on the whole transaction, and he submitted that that was not such an agreement as the House should sanction. If all the great shipping companies were to have this example held up to them and were able to do this by a mere threat, millions of money would be extracted from the British Government and all security for economy in the future would vanish. He begged to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that this was a naval subsidy pure and simple, and would appear in the Naval Estimates. It was given only on the ground of exceptional ocean-steaming speed, as recommended by the Shipping Subsidies Committee. It was the measure of the loss which this company expected from running these two high-speed vessels for commercial purposes. That was what it substantially amounted to. The steamship company were responsible for the building of the ships and for producing a speed of twenty-four and a half knots, and the company took the whole of the risk. The House had definitely approved the agreement, and thereupon the company had ordered the ships which were now being built, one on the Tyne and the other on the Clyde. With regard to the point raised by the hon. Member for Islington, he wished to remind him that a speed of twenty-five knots an hour in vessels of the scout class was a totally different thing to the continuous ocean speed required in these ocean steamers. The reason why it was necessary for this country to have vessels of this character was that there were existing several great ocean steamships not belonging to this country which had a speed of twenty-two and twenty-three knots, and in time of war we would have nothing which could compete with them in speed. It was solely to meet that state of things that this subsidy was granted.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said the proposal of the Government was to have two fast vessels. If it was necessary for this country to have fast steamers the Government were not justified in being satisfied with the building of two ships only. If Germany was so much in advance of us, why did we stop with two ships? If the principle of this agreement was correct, why did not the Government begin to build more? Why should we confine ourselves to the ships of the Cunard Company? Were there not other British steamship companies that would gladly build on the same terms? The effect of this agreement would be to give an advantage to one British line of steamers in the Atlantic trade. If the policy was to protect British shipping, twenty fast ships would not be too many if consideration was given to the enormous volume of British sea commerce in comparison with the commerce of foreign countries. Obviously this policy was too limited to do any good. What subsidy did the German ships get? They did not get a penny, and the ships were run on mercantile principles. He was aware that German ships running to other places got subsidies, but those engaged in the service to America did not get a penny. If the German companies could do this as a mercantile transaction, why should not the Cunard Company be able to do it? Nobody would think of going by the Cunard service if they could go by a German line. Therefore, so far as the Cunard Company was concerned, this was an attempt to bolster up one company in order to compete with other British shipowners who were to have no subsidy. He thought that in this matter the Government should not confine themselves to one British company.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said he was interested to hear the Secretary to the Admiralty say that the subsidy was a naval subsidy pure and simple. Did he intend to convey to the House that this was a naval project pure and simple? If that was so it did not tally with the statement made last year by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, who was then at the Admiralty. He stated quite emphatically that this was partly a business arrangement. One of the justifications put forward for the proposal was that it would relieve a state of purely commercial panic, and support was given to it throughout the debate on the ground that the agreement would combine a commercial advantage with a naval advantage. The truth was that but for the Morgan Combine they would have heard nothing whatever about it. The Secretary to the Admiralty had said that the subsidy was a purely naval subsidy. The right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Department stated that it was to preserve our prestige on the Atlantic as well as for naval purposes. To come down now and say that it was a purely naval subsidy was to mislead the House. The Secretary to the Admiralty was asked two or three specific Questions with regard to the functions of these vessels. He was asked whether they were to be merchant cruisers, scouts, or despatch vessels. To these Questions they had had absolutely no reply. He doubted very much whether the hon. Gentleman and the Admiralty had made up their minds as to the definite work on which these vessels would be used in future. It was a peculiar fact that at the very time that the Admiralty embarked on this enormously costly scheme, they were wiping out the old merchant cruiser subsidies and they had laid down something like eight scouts, part of whose work certainly might have been undertaken by these two vessels. Now they understood that these vessels were to go beyond the duties of mere scouts; they were to range over a much greater area and to a certain extent they were to do scouting work. He presumed that was so. Did the Secretary to the Admiralty go so far as to say that the new vessels would be used as merchant cruisers?

Mr. PRETYMAN: That is one of the duties which they will be able to perform if required.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said that last year in the Memorandum of the First Lord of the Admiralty that Minister declared emphatically that the use of merchant cruisers was now abandoned by the Admiralty. How on earth were they to square that with the statement that had now fallen from the Secretary to the Admiralty? But, take it on the basis of the statement the hon. Gentleman had made, did he mean to say that the exact function which those vessels were supposed to perform could only be performed by vessels of 30,000 tons and costing £1,300,000 apiece? The cost to the country of running each of these vessels would be £75,000 a year. But the total cost of running a battleship, which we had entirely in our own hands and under our own control and specially fitted for the purpose for which she was required, only came to something like £100,000 per annum.

Mr. PRETYMAN: That does not include repairs.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: How much did that amount to? Last year the amount spent on repairs for the whole Fleet was only £175,000. Really, if they took it on the financial basis alone, the Government had made an extremely bad bargain for themselves. The only reply made to the comparison he had offered was that these vessels running in the Atlantic trade would always be running, and therefore they would always be able to get the maximum speed out of them. If that was the case there was something seriously wrong with the Admiralty control if they could not get the maximum speed out of their vessels, whether battleships or cruisers. What they were entitled to know was, "How far did the Admiralty intend to go with the scheme?" Really if it was justified for two vessels it must certainly be justified for four; and if two were sufficient to compete with the German four, what would happen if the Germans in a few years constructed vessels which, instead of steaming twenty-three-and-a-half knots, would steam twenty-five? Would the Admiralty come down and ask them for vessels of twenty-five-and-a-half knots?

Then the Secretary to the Admiralty had made absolutely no reply to the charge that in entering the purchase price of the vessels in the agreement, they entered prices largely in excess of the value of the vessels concerned. He understood that the view taken by the Secretary to the Admiralty was that the reason they had to have inflated prices in this agreement, whether for purchase or hire, was that the agreement being compulsory, they must of necessity pay more than if it were voluntary. That was a reasonable argument, but there surely must be limits even to the amount that they would put on compulsory purchase. The amounts put down for the vessels named in the agreement was far in excess of their value at the time it was made, and even if they knocked off the 6 per cent. per annum it was enormously in excess of their value at the present time. The vessels were estimated at something like £18 a ton on their total tonnage, and no steamship company would ever for one moment believe that the Cunard fleet named in this agreement was worth an average price of £18 a ton. The Secretary to the Admiralty made no reply to that. He had not justified either the scheme itself or the figures contained in the scheme, and the only defence he had produced so far in the House in respect of the agreement was that the bargain turned out to be a hard one for the Cunard Company. What they had to decide in that House was not whether the Cunard Company had made a bad agreement or not, but whether the Government had made a bad bargain; and looked at from any point of view they had made an extraordinarily bad bargain. They had not justified the policy, and they had certainly not justified the figures. He suggested to the Admiralty that this should be the last transaction of the kind into which they should enter. Last year the scheme was brought down for the approval of the House on the 12th August, just before the House rose, and there was no full discussion on it, though, in a matter involving £2,600,000, the Government should have obtained the well-considered approval of the House before entering into a binding agreement. They should not have entered into the agreement out of pure panic, which those who knew more about the details laughed at at the time. The naval justification for the agreement was extremely thin, and he challenged the Secretary to the Admiralty to get up and say that either Sir George Clarke or Sir John Fisher had a word to say in approval of the bargain which he had made.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 138: Noes, 34. (Division List No. 315.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edward H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane,Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb,Rt.Hn. Sir John C. R.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down. North)
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon. Sir WilliamHart
Fergusson,Rt.Hn Sir J.(Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,Walford D(Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lee,Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHn.A Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sandys,Lieut-Col.Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S (Marylebone, W.)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E. R.
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Elibank, Master of
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, J. M. F.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy VincentP. (Cavan, W.
Kilbride, Denis
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
Reckitt, Harold James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Lough and Mr. M'Kenna.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (MONEY) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said this Bill was an example of the injury a Chancellor of the Exchequer could accomplish by upsetting the finances of the country. There were two objections to the Bill. One was that it was bad finance; and the other was that it upset the entire financial world by the issue of Treasury Bills at the present period. Immediately the Resolution on which the Bill was founded was introduced, Consols fell to eighty-seven; but when it was announced that Exchequer Bonds were to be issued, and that only about £6,000,000 would be required, an improvement in the financial situation at once occurred. He would move that the Bill be read that day three months.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax), in seconding the Amendment, said it was very desirable that the House should have a clear statement as to the exact position of the floating debt. As far as he could make out, the amounts referred to in the Bill as authorised by various Acts to be raised by terminable annuities, which the right hon. Gentleman now proposed to take power to raise by Exchequer Bonds, represented a total of nearer £28,000,000 than the £10,000,000 recently mentioned. The amount authorised but not yet raised under the Naval Works Act was £14,800,000; under the Military Works Act £10,580,000; under the Public Buildings (Expenses) Act £1,600,000; and there were also various other smaller items. He believed it was a fact that the net result of the borrowing during the current year would be that the National Debt would be £2,500,000 larger at the end of the year than it was at the beginning. That was a very serious condition of affairs two years after the close of the war, and one which ought to make the House pause before granting these extended powers to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had given the right hon. Gentleman private notice of the Questions he desired answered; therefore it was unnecessary to detain the House at greater length.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) asked whether there was any special reason for Exchequer Bonds being mentioned as the form in which the money should be raised. Exchequer Bonds were extremely unpopular in the City, and were not accepted on foreign money markets. Treasury Bills, on the other hand, were an extremely popular form of investment. On previous occasions the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken a discretion as to the manner in which he should raise money, and there appeared to be no advantage in fixing Exchequer Bonds as the form to be adopted in this case.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) complained of the House having to discuss at so late a period of the session and at such an hour of the night an important Bill involving a totally new policy with regard to capital expenditure. He feared that the enabling of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to raise capital sums more easily would tend to increase the pressure put upon him to incur capital expenditure. In his Budget speech the right hon. Gentleman said he was doing his best to curtail capital expenditure as much as possible, but inasmuch as the amount had been reduced only from £10,000,000 to £9,250,000 his efforts had not achieved any very substantial result. Last year the net reduction of debt amounted to under £1,000,000, but this year there would actually be an addition of about £2,500,000, and, worse still, the £9,250,000 would be borrowed at a higher rate of interest than was being paid on the £7,000,000 that would be paid off. He could only express his profound regret at this large capital expenditure.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said the more he listened to the observations of the hon. Gentleman on this subject the more impracticable appeared to be his view of the situation. Many of the works upon which this capital expenditure was to be made had been in progress for some time, and contracts for their completion had been entered into. Such contracts could not be stopped in the middle simply because, on financial grounds, it might be convenient to postpone the operations. In consultation with his colleagues he had agreed that new works not necessary for the completion of those already entered upon or not urgently required for the defence of the country should not be begun under present circumstances, and the money which he had indicated as the capital expenditure likely to be required during the current year was for works now in progress and for defensive works urgently required. The hon. Gentleman was mistaken in supposing that it would be easier for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to borrow by means of Exchequer Bonds than under the old system of terminable annuities. It was a much more delicate operation, and he had resorted to it only because it was necessary to carry out the will of Parliament as embodied in previous Acts. The Bill authorised the Treasury to raise by Exchequer Bonds any money which they were now authorised to raise under enabling Acts by terminable annuities. The amount which he anticipated would be expended on capital account under those Acts during the present year was £9,250,000, and under the Bill just read a second time power was taken to raise a further £2,600,000 for the purposes of the Cunard Agreement. He could not say the exact amount that would be required for that purpose during the current year, but he did not anticipate that it would exceed £600,000, so that the total to be raised this year would be about £9,750,000 He had reason to believe that from £3,000,000 to £4,000,000 would be available in the ordinary way, and to that extent he would be able to provide for the expenditure by terminable annuities. The balance he proposed to raise by Exchequer Bonds. It was perfectly true that the Bill did not limit the power to raise money by Exchequer Bonds to the current year. The Questions asked by the hon. Member for Halifax in the letter to which he had referred involved a great number of figures, which could be more conveniently given in reply to an unstarred Question. He might say, however, in regard to the price at which recent issues had been made, that the Treasury Bills issued on 2nd July for six months were issued at rates equivalent to £2 5s. 3d. per cent. The Bills issued on the 2nd of July, for twelve months, were issued at an interest of £2 18s. 2d., while Exchequer Bonds were issued during the present month under favourable circumstances at £98 13s. 6d., giving a yield in interest of £3 9s. 9d. The hon. Member opposite had suggested that he should provide for these borrowings by Treasury Bills. There were already nearly £29,000,000 of Treasury Bills outstanding, and they had to rely upon them for financing the Exchequer. He did not think that under the circumstances it would be a wise proceeding to issue a larger amount of Treasury Bills, and they were not suitable for a loan which there was no possibility of paying off when the Bill fell due.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said that by issuing Exchequer Bonds instead of Treasury Bills the country was paying 1 per cent. more. If it was worth 1 per cent why issue Exchequer Bonds? In one of his speeches the Chancellor of the Exchequer drew attention to the enormous growth of local indebtedness and he lectured local bodies for borrowing so largely. His opinion was that corporations like Manchester and Leeds would feel ashamed if their credit fell so low that they had to pay 3½ per cent. interest for their loans, because they only paid 3 per cent at the present time. It was rather a significant comment that when the right hon. Gentleman issued Exchequer Bonds he should have to pay a larger rate of interest than the local authorities whom he lectured for their extravagance.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he did not wish to put the House to the trouble of a division. He had made his protest, and he asked permission to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put:—

The House divided:—Ayes, 129 Noes, 32. (Division List, No. 316.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Majendie, James A. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. N. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rea, Russell
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Delany, William
Elibank, Master of
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kilbride, Denis
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Reckitt, Harold James
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. J. H. Whitley.

Bill read a second time, and committed for this day.

DOGS BILL.

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [23rd March], "That the Bill be now read a second time," read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Order for Committee read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

BISHOPRIC OF BRISTOL BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

PROVISIONAL ORDER (MARRIAGES) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd May], "That the Bill be now read a second time," read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS NAMES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

SITE FOR DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

CONSTABULARY (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Committee read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

JUDICATURE AND DEVELOPMENT GRANT (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 to 5 agreed to.

Clause 6:—

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he had given notice of a number of Amendments on the Bill, but as the Postmaster-General had met him in regard to the questions he intended to raise he would not move the Amendments. The Amendment to Clause 6 dealt with rights of way, and although he did not wish to press it now, he would state his objection on a future occasion.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment, read the third time, and passed.

POOR LAW AUTHORITIES (TRANSFER OF PROPERTY) BILL [LORDS].

Read a second time, and committed for this day.

GOVERNMENT SHIPS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the Whole House.—(*Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*)

Resolved, That this House will, upon Friday, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*)

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS (REMISSION).

Committee to consider of authorising the Remission of a Debt due to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland in pursuance of any Act of the present session relating to Local Loans (King's Recommendation signified), this day.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1902–3.

Committee to consider the savings and Deficiencies upon Navy and Army Grants for 1902–3, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to the Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, this day. (*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented on the 15th day of February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS FOUNDATION.

Resolved, That the statement of the estimated Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers Foundation for the year 1904–5 be approved.—(*Mr. Arthur Lee.*)

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. Deputy - Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at eighteen minutes before Two o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 9th August, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Carlisle Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]; De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; Leyton Urban District Council Bill; Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill; Glasgow and South-Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill; Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

STANDING ORDERS.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES (Lord Balfour of Burleigh): My Lords, the object of the Motion standing in my name is to effect some Amendments in the Standing Orders rendered necessary by the transference of a Department from the Board of Trade to the Board of Agriculture. It is also proposed that hereafter there should be a Standing Order that when under the Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Act a Joint Committee is required it shall always consist of three Members from each House unless the Standing Order is suspended.

Moved, That the Standing Orders be amended as follows—

26. In cases where tidal lands within the ordinary spring tides are to be acquired or in any way affected a copy of the plans and sections shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November immediately preceding the application for the Bill, be deposited at the Office of the Harbour Department, Board of Trade, marked "Tidal Waters," and on such copy all tidal waters shall be coloured blue and, if the plan include any bridge across tidal waters, the dimensions as regards span and headway of the nearest bridges, if any, across the same tidal waters, above and below the proposed new bridge, shall be marked thereon; and in all such cases, such plans and sections shall be accompanied by an Ordnance map of the country over which the works are proposed to extend, or are to be carried, with their position and extent, or route accurately laid down thereon.

And in cases where the work is to be situate on the banks, foreshore, or bed of any river, a copy of the plans and sections, shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November immediately preceding the application for the Bill, be deposited—

(1) if the river is in England or Wales, at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries; or

(2) if the river is in Scotland, at the office of the Secretary for Scotland; or

(3) if the river is in Ireland, at the Irish Office, Westminster, and at the Office of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, Dublin; and

(4) if the river is subject to a Board of Conservators, at the Office also of such Board.

30. Where by any Bill power is sought to take any churchyard, burial ground, or cemetery, or any part thereof, or to disturb the bodies interred therein, or

where power is sought to take any common or commonable land, as the case may be, a copy of so much of the plans, sections, and books of reference required by these Orders to be deposited in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments in respect of such Bill as relates to such churchyard, burial ground, or cemetery, common or commonable land, shall, on or before the thirtieth day of November, be deposited at the Office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and a copy of so much of the said plans, sections, and books of reference as relates to such common or commonable lands shall, on or before the said day, be deposited at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

33. On or before the twenty-first day of December a printed copy shall be deposited—

(1) Of every Local Bill at the Office of His Majesty's Treasury, at the Local Government Board, and at the General Post Office;

(4) Of every local Bill relating to any dock, harbour, navigation, pier, port, or tidal waters, at the Office of the Harbour Department of the Board of Trade, marked "Tidal Waters,"

(5.) Of every Bill of the Second Class whereby it is intended to authorise the construction of any work on the banks, foreshore, or bed of any river, at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and at the Office of the Conservators of the River (if any);

(7.) Of every Local Bill—

(*a*) relating to a local court or stipendiary magistrate;

(*b*) whereby power is sought to take any churchyard, burial ground, cemetery, or any part thereof, or to disturb the bodies interred therein, or to take any common or commonable land;

(*c*) in which provisions are contained relating to houses inhabited by the working class in London.

(*d*) promoted by any Municipal or other Local Authority, by which it is proposed to create powers relating to police or sanitary regulations which deviate from, or are in extension of, or repugnant to the general law;

at the Office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department;

(12.) Of every local Bill which relates to the drainage of land in England or Wales, or which relates to the improvement of land in England, Wales, or Scotland, or to the erection, improvement, repair, maintenance, or regulation of any market or market place at which cattle are exposed for sale, or to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries or which proposes to alter the boundary of any county, urban or rural district, parish, or any other administrative area in the United Kingdom, or whereby power is sought to take any common or commonable land, at the Office of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Leave out Standing Order 38 and insert as a new Standing Order—

38. Where any Bill contains or revives or extends power to take compulsorily or by agreement any land in any local area as defined for the purposes of this Order, and such taking involves, or may involve, the taking in of that area of any house or houses occupied either wholly or partially by thirty or more persons of the working class, whether as tenants or lodgers, the promoters shall deposit in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, and at the office of the central authority, on or before the 21st day of December, a statement giving the description and postal address of each of such houses, its number on the deposited plans, the parish in which it is situate, and the number (so far as can be ascertained) of persons of the working class residing in it, and also a copy of so much of the deposited plans (if any) as relates thereto.

This Order shall not apply where a statement in pursuance of this Order was deposited in respect of the Act, the powers of which are proposed to be revived or extended.

For the purposes of this Order the expression "local area" means—

(1) As respects London, the Administrative County of London;

(2) As respects England and Wales (outside London), any borough, or other urban district, and elsewhere than in a borough or other urban district, any parish;

(3) As respects Scotland, any district within the meaning of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; and

(4) As respects Ireland, any urban district;

The expression "house" means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling.

The expression "working class" means mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons, other than domestic servants, whose income in any case does not exceed an average of thirty shillings a week and the families of any of such persons who may be residing with them.

The expression "central authority" means, as regards London, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and, as regards England and Wales (outside London), the Local Government Board, as regards Scotland, the Secretary for Scotland, and as regards Ireland, the Local Government Board for Ireland.

The expression "Bill" includes a Bill confirming a Provisional Order.

77. The Examiner may admit affidavits in proof of the compliance with the Standing Orders, or may require further evidence; and such affidavits shall be sworn, if in England or in Ireland, before a justice of the peace or commissioner for oaths, and if in Scotland, before any sheriff depute or his substitute, or a justice of the peace.

104*a*. The Committee on any Local Bill may, if they think fit, admit affidavits in proof of any allegation, deed, or document mentioned or set forth in the Bill or in any schedule thereto, or may require further evidence. Such affidavits shall be entitled "In the matter of a Bill now pending in the House of Lords, of which the short title is [insert the short title]," and shall be sworn, if in England or in Ireland, before a justice of the peace or a commissioner for oaths, and if in Scotland, before any sheriff depute or his substitute, or a justice of the peace. Such affidavits shall be filed in the office of the Clerk of the Parliaments.

111. In the case of every Bill which gives, revives, or extends power to take land in Scotland or in Ireland, compulsorily or by agreement, clauses shall be inserted—

(1) Providing that the promoters shall not in the exercise of such power purchase or acquire in any local area any house or houses, occupied either wholly or partially by thirty or more persons belonging to the working class, as tenants or lodgers unless and until

(*a*) They shall have obtained the approval of the Central Authority to a scheme for providing new dwellings for the persons residing in such houses, or for such number or proportion of such persons as the Central Authority shall, after inquiry, deem necessary, having regard to the number of persons residing in the houses liable to be taken and working within one mile therefrom, and to the amount of vacant suitable accommodation in the immediate neighbourhood of the houses liable to be taken, or to the place of employment of such persons, and all the other circumstances of the case; and

(*b*) They shall have given security to the satisfaction of the Central Authority for the carrying out of the scheme.

(2) Imposing adequate penalties on the promoters in the event of houses being acquired or appropriated for the purposes of the Bill in contravention of the foregoing provisions;

(3) Providing that the expenses or any part of the expenses incurred by the Central Authority under this Order shall be defrayed by the promoters of the Bill, or out of moneys to be raised under the Bill; and

(4) Conferring on the promoters and on the Central Authority respectively any powers that may be

necessary to enable full effect to be given to the said scheme.

Expressions defined in Order 38 have the same meanings in this Order.

NEW STANDING ORDER.

186A. Where under the provisions of Section 9 of the Procedure Act, a Confirmation Bill has been referred to a Joint Committee, the Committee of this House shall consist of three members.—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Agreed to.

Standing Orders amended accordingly, and to be printed as amended. [No. 187.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 5) BILL.

Moved, That the order made on the 16th day of March last, " That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Earl of Denbigh.*)

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: I made it a condition of agreeing to the suspension of the Standing Order in this case that there should be no opposition to the Provisional Order. I have had communications both from the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General for Ireland that that is so, and I am satisfied that the request for the suspension of the Standing Order is a reasonable one in all the circumstances.

On Question, Motion agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

STATISTICS.

1. Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates in each year from 1889 to 1903. Forty-first Number;

2. Statistical Tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates. Part XXVII. 1902.

BRITISH COLONIES (DUTIES ON IMPORTS).

Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates. 1904.

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.

Appendix to the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. Vol. III. Appendix and General Index.

TREATY SERIES, No. 5 (1904).

Accession of China to the Convention, signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded in armies in the field.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3250. Turkey (Salonica).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CLERGY (WEST INDIES).

Return of the amount payable on 5th January, 1904, out of the Consolidated Fund for ecclesiastical purposes in the West Indies. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.]; Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [H.L.]; Sea Fisheries Bill [H.L.]; Chantrey Trust. Message from the Commons for copies of the Reports, etc., from the Select Committees. Ordered to be communicated accordingly.

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill. Report, etc., of the Select Committee of the House of Commons communicated, pursuant to Message of Thursday last, and to be printed. (No. 186.)

County of Suffolk Bill. House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3a on Thursday next.

LICENSING BILL.

[Third Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 3ª." —(*Lord Belper.*)

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I do not propose to vote against the Third Reading of this Bill, but I wish to state as strongly as I can the views which we on this side of the House hold on the subject, and to make what must be a final protest. It may be as well to refer to what has been done in the past on this subject. There has been a great deal of legislation on the liquor question. There was legislation in the eighteenth century, which has been strongly alluded to by the great historian, the late Mr. Lecky, who wrote that the liquor legislation of the eighteenth century was—

> "Incomparably more momentous than any event in the purely political or military annals of the country."

Then, as we all know, in the earlier part of the nineteenth century there was an attempt to introduce free trade in liquor, with the intent to benefit the country; yet that was a signal failure. I am sadly afraid that the present Bill will have no better success than the legislation to which I have referred. All I wish to say upon that is that the responsibility for this Bill, if it be a blunder, rests with the present Government; we, the Opposition, entirely wash our hands of it.

The Prime Minister some time ago, in the course of a speech on this subject, indicated that he did not expect legislation to effect a great deal of improvement with regard to drunkenness. I know that that view is held by various people, who think that, just as in Victorian years there was an enormous change for the better in regard to sobriety among the upper and upper-middle classes, probably a higher standard of morality and custom will gradually permeate the working classes. I cannot help thinking that those who urge that view forget the entirely different circumstances in which the working classes are placed. They live in squalid homes, with overcrowded and insanitary rooms, homes situated in slums in which there is a congestion of licensed houses. Can we be surprised if in these circumstances the working classes are open to the temptations of drink? I feel certain that the excessive number of public-houses in many places is of serious detriment to the morality of the poor. I think the way in which this Bill has been carried in the House of Commons must have a great effect in the country. It is a piece of legislation of a most complicated character, and therefore required lengthened and instructed criticism. No doubt there was an immense number of Amendments; but the Prime Minister himself declared on one occasion that he could not say there had been real obstruction. The Government themselves and their supporters proposed over 200 Amendments to the Bill, which showed, I think, the great necessity for the consideration of the Bill and of those Amendments, of which only one-tenth, I believe, were discussed. Therefore I would venture to say that this legislation represents more an edict of the Cabinet than a matured measure coming from Parliament I deeply regret this. I do not find that His Majesty's Government have been at all inclined to consider many of the Amendments which have been urged against the Bill, or many of the Amendments which have been proposed.

The first of what I believe to be the two great objections to the Bill is the alteration in the jurisdiction of the licensing magistrates for the future. My own opinion is that the alteration is exceedingly harmful. Under it the power of brewster sessions will be extremely limited. It destroys the close touch which brewster sessions had with the immediate locality, and I cannot for a moment believe that, so far as the question of redundant licences is concerned, they will be half as effectual as they were under the existing arrangement, while I am quite certain that a division of authority among brewster sessions, petty sessions, and quarter sessions will weaken and impair the value of the measure. I was somewhat surprised at the horror expressed when my noble and learned friend Lord Coleridge proposed an Amendment to place on the committee of quarter sessions county council representatives. I would like to remind His Majesty's Government that they pronounced a very distinct opinion in favour of representatives of the people managing licensing matters in the Bill which they themselves introduced in 1888. In moving that Bill Mr. Ritchie, who was I think Home Secretary at the time, proposed that quarter sessions should divide their jurisdiction into districts and should control the whole of the licensing in those districts. The Cabinet of the day assented to that principle, and therefore I could not understand why there should have been such protestation against the very mild suggestion of my noble and learned friend.

The second great objection I have to the Bill is that it is no adequate reform. We have heard a great deal about the £1,250,000 that will be obtained by this fund for the abolition of redundant licences. I do not wish to dwell at any length upon this, but I would remind your Lordships that quarter sessions will not be bound to levy it and the whole money may not be collected. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London put that very strongly, and I cannot refrain from referring to what he said. It is so important that it ought to be thoroughly understood. The right rev. Prelate said—

> "Between March, 1890, and March, 1903, 552 on-licences were suppressed in London, and if progress were made at the same rate there would be a reduction in forty-eight years of 2,038 licences, whereas under the operation of this Bill the utmost would be 1,855 reductions."

Then the right rev. Prelate turned to the country and asked whether there would be any greater reduction than was now going on. He had figures which showed that there had been twenty-four licences refused in 1903 at brewster sessions in Liverpool. The reduction under the Bill, said the right rev. Prelate, would be eighteen. In Manchester forty were refused, under the Bill it would be seventeen; Exeter thirteen, under the Bill two; Canterbury nine, under the Bill two; Swansea sixteen, under the Bill five. The right rev. Prelate, continuing, said it was the same in the counties, and that if this Bill was to be recommended to temperance reformers those who brought it in must show that under it the reduction would be greater than if no measure was passed. That, I think, is a very strong statement as showing that the Bill will not adequately reduce licences in the country. Then I come to a very important statement made by the Lord Mayor of Manchester, who, speaking at a meeting of the Manchester City Justices, said—

> 'The Bill in operation would not be of the slightest benefit to a city like Manchester, as it could not possibly effect within any reasonable time either a material reduction in the number of licences or in the amount of drunkenness."

Earl Spencer.

He gave one striking example. In the district of Hulme, a part of Manchester, the brewers had agreed to surrender fifty licences before the last brewster sessions. But, said the Lord Mayor—

> "The fifty licences have not been surrendered in consequence of the anticipated passing of the Bill. Manchester, under the Bill, might be able to reduce twenty licences a year."

The discussion on this Bill in your Lordships' House has shown the meaning of the monopoly value of a licence. It is quite clear that the holder of one of these licences has a much better investment than any other trader. He has a much richer business than the grocer, the fruiterer, or any other tradesman. And why? Because he has received a monopoly from the State, and a monopoly which, in my opinion, and in the opinion of most of us on this side of the House, is not a permanent monopoly because it is legally only for a year. This Bill increases enormously the value of the business of this trade. We, on the other hand, claim that this monopoly value should be the property of the State. We meet the Government's compensation by a claim for what I will call restitution—the recovery by the State of the monopoly which the State has created, and which, for its own Imperial purposes, the State in future must be endowed with. I do not think the Bill will settle this question. I say that with great sorrow, because I should have liked the Bill to have achieved that object, and I should like to have seen your Lordships' House rise to the occasion and force on the Government some proposal which might have had this effect. I have often heard it said that temperance reformers are extremely violent and immoderate in their demands. That may have been so in the past, but I maintain that temperance reformers during the discussions here and elsewhere have been extremely moderate and have made great concessions. The noble Viscount who presided over the Royal Commission on Licensing, and who was the author of the Minority Report which advocated the strongest measures of reform, waived his individual views on this subject in order to support the most rev. Primate in the very far-reaching proposal which he moved providing a time limit. I, and many of my noble friends waived our other objections in order to concentrate ourselves on this moderate proposal, which we regret was not accepted.

I am not going to say what will happen after this Bill, which we consider neither just nor right, has passed. It may have a better effect than we think it will have, but I am afraid it will not. We have been continually told by noble Lords opposite that we will be able to alter it when we come into power. That is perfectly true; but I very much regret that it should have been thought necessary to make a suggestion of that kind with regard to a great measure—the only measure of the Government this session—which should have been framed with a view to a settlement of the question which is so greatly agitating the country. The noble Viscount used these very significant words—

> "We have before us a struggle for mastery between the State and the trade."

I have always abstained from twitting the Government with being in the hands of the trade, but I am afraid there is a great deal of evidence that the Government have been strongly attacked by the trade, and I cannot help thinking that they have introduced many of the clauses at the instance of the trade. I find this remarkable passage in an article in the *Licensing World and Licensing Trade Review*, a paper which, I have no doubt, speaks authoritatively on this subject—

> "The Government Amendments proposed in the Upper House do not materially affect its provisions."

Everybody will agree with that—

> "And there is little doubt that the Commons will accept them. With these we must deal next week, merely--"

and this is what I wish to lay stress on—

> "congratulating in the meantime both the trade and the Government on the extremely satisfactory majorities by which the various stages of the Bill have hitherto been carried. The promises of our friends have been nobly kept, and when the opportunity arises our appreciation thereof shall be proved."

Such an organisation as that of the trade may be, and often is, a menace to the Government of the day. If the example of what has been done in reference to the brewing interest were followed we should be in nearly as bad a position in regard to the high character and morality of Parliament as some other countries are. I trust that the object-lesson supplied by this Bill will have the effect of preventing the carrying of those measures of a protective character which Mr. Chamberlain is pressing upon the country. I deeply regret the passing of this measure and the methods by which the Government has passed it. I consider that in its present form the Bill will impair and shackle the efforts of real and earnest licensing reformers, and will in no way bring about a diminution of drinking and drunkenness in this country, with all its consequences of crime and poverty.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, as the Episcopal Bench has been perhaps unusally prominent in these discussions, I should like to say a few words before the Bill passes from the purview of your Lordships' House. To say that we who sit on these Benches are not disappointed at the outcome of the week's discussion would be, of course, to stultify the action that we have taken throughout. We are disappointed. We did believe that we could, without unfairness to anybody, make the Bill a good deal better than it was when it left the House of Commons and came to this House, and we did hope for a more favourable hearing than we obtained from those who sit on the Government Bench. As the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, we modified the proposals we made at the risk of finding them regarded by our friends as having been emasculated to the point of uselessness. I do not think they would have been useless if they had been carried. I believe the Amendment we proposed with regard to the time limit would have made all the difference in the world as regards the future working of the Bill.

Those who try to take a moderate position in matters of this kind are, I suppose, always exposed to two fires. We have been exposed to the fire of those who sit upon the Government Bench in this House. The noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal, while speaking with perfect courtesy, let it be not obscurely understood that he did regard a good many of us who were opposed to him in some of these matters as faddists, or as men who were really at heart adverse to the existence of the trade and its licences altogether. Nothing could be further from the fact, but we have been undoubtedly so represented. On the other hand, we have found throughout these months of controversy that the advance wing of temperance reformers thought that they were not being helped as they ought by us, and that we (as it was put by a leading organ of a political kind the other day) would obviously prefer to see England remain drunk rather than to see it not under the dominance of the Episcopal Bench. That kind of acerbity may be disregarded altogether.

But at the same time it ought to be remembered that when we have come forward and tried to make a move of this kind, it has not been without the compulsion of separating ourselves to some extent from those who would go further in the direction of reform, and who are actuated by deep-seated principles and by motives of a high and lofty sort. We did take that position. We have done our best. We have tried to fight for what seemed to us to be principles rather than worry over small details in the machinery. But we have been fairly beaten in those endeavours. The Government has been stiff, and, as we think, unduly unyielding. We may be mistaken, but we still believe that a great many of the details of this measure will prove extraordinarily difficult to work out in practice. All that I should like to say now is that if the time comes when it is found that there is a reaction against the provisions of this measure, because of their cumbrousness and unworkableness or their ineffectiveness in doing what they profess to do, I hope it will be remembered that we did make a genuine endeavour, without success, to obtain Amendments.

We have now got the Bill, and, as my right rev. brother said the other night, we have got to live with it, at any rate for a time. Personally, I do not believe it will be a very long time that we shall have to live with it exactly as it is, and this, not so much because of the probability of our opponents desiring to reopen the question at an early date—I think experience shows that to reopen this question is not a task that is much loved by any Government, or Party—but because, as I believe, the machinery will require re-setting; and incidentally, therefore, the question will have to be more or less reopened. But while we have got the Bill as it is, I desire to say most emphatically, speaking at all events for myself, and I think I may say for a great many others, that we do mean to do our very best to make it work well. We desire by public guidance, by private counsel and advice, and by loyalty to its principles, so far as they go, to make it work as well as ever we can for a cause we all have at heart. We can say, and we do say, that it will not be our fault if the Act does not work well. We desire to help forward the cause which we are told this Bill is designed to promote, and if our fears are falsified and the Bill turns out in working to be so much better than we have anticipated, no one will be more thankful than those whom I have the privilege of representing.

Lord BELPER: My Lords, I have no intention of addressing your Lordships at any length on this occasion, but I do not think it would be respectful to the noble Earl opposite that on this, the last occasion that we have of discussing the details of the measure, his remarks should go entirely unanswered. Let me say, in the first place, that I fully recognise the fair and reasonable spirit in which the most rev. Primate, and also the noble Earl opposite, have made the protest which they think necessary at this the last stage of the Bill. I know that their views with regard to this measure differ widely from ours, and I acknowledge that they have a perfect right, not having succeeded in carrying many of the Amendments which they proposed, in making their protest against the Bill, and at the same time I recognise that they have done it in a spirit to which no one could take exception. The first point to which the noble Earl addressed himself was, I think, the jurisdiction of magistrates. I ventured, in moving the Second Reading, to go at some length into the actual proposals of the Bill, because I felt that some injustice had been done and that the proposals had not been fairly represented. Notwithstanding all the criticism that has been passed upon the proposed changes, I still maintain that the views and interests of the local bench are well protected.

It is not fair to make the distinction sought to be set up between the local magistrates and quarter sessions. The latter are composed of local justices, and local opinion will not and cannot be ignored, while it is absolutely essential that the fund should be under the administration of the county authority. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London made some remarks on the Second Reading of a very trenchant character with regard to the number of licences that had already been done away with and the number that would be abolished in the future under this Bill. I think it has already been shown that the basis of his calculation was one which he would himself admit ought to be modified, in view of the facts that have been laid before him. He took a basis which was much higher than that which would probably apply to the average licence done away with, and in that way he made it appear that fewer licences would be abolished under this Bill than would otherwise be the case. By reference to what has been done in Liverpool, Manchester, and elsewhere in the reduction of licences, an endeavour has been made to show that the effect of the Bill will be small; but the broad fact is that while the highest number of licences done away with in a year on the ground of non-requirement was 200, under the Bill the lowest estimate for the first year's operations is 1,500.

It is perfectly true that this Bill does recognise monopoly value in licences at present in existence; that has been allowed to grow up, and the Government do not feel that they would be acting justly in ignoring it, especially when the compensation is to come out of the pockets of the members of the trade themselves. What I ask the House to remember, and I do not think it has been recognised as fully as it ought to have been in this House, is that for the first time in any legislation the trade is going to pay the whole of the compensation out of their own pockets. I venture to say that if that proposal had been made a few years ago there would have been little opportunity of its reaching this House. This fund which the trade will pay is not a small sum. A remark was made at the last stage of the Bill deprecating giving increased value to brewers who had more than one house done away with. It was said that the higher scale which they would be charged would be quite out of proportion to the increase in the value of their premises; but let the House remember that there is nothing else out of which they can be compensated but this fund which they contribute themselves. Something like 80 per cent. of the total number of public-houses are tied houses, and I think it will be admitted that tied houses are of at least as great value as ordinary houses. If that is the case, it is making a very low estimate, supposing the provisions in this Bill are fully enforced, to say that the actual contributions of the trade themselves during each year will be about £1,000,000. That is not a small sum, and although they will get compensation for disturbance they will for many years before their houses are touched pay this very large levy.

The proposal for a time limit the Government could not see their way in fairness to accept, and if it should be the desire of the country that licences should be reduced more quickly than the rate the Bill provides, then the only reasonable and logical way of doing it would be by the public providing the fund for the purpose. I had a conversation during the week with a gentleman who has had as large an experience in the management of hotels and houses in which spirituous liquors are sold as anybody in the country, and he stated that he looked for the promotion of temperance, not so much to the doing away of a very large number of public-houses as to a change in the conditions, which will lead to the setting up of refreshment houses, in which direction Lord Grey and others have done such useful work, houses in which there will be discouragement of excessive drinking. I cannot see myself, why, when a reasonable number of houses have been reduced, the magistrates should not largely make use of the power they have of doing away with the present public-houses in order to set up houses under conditions which would be satisfactory to the public and tend against excessive drinking. Although we should have liked to have met the Amendments of the Opposition to a much larger extent than we were able to, I nevertheless sincerely believe that the Bill will prove a measure which will lead to a very appreciable reduction in the number of public-houses, and with a considerable reduction of the existing number of licences the Bill will, I believe, pave the way to a much better condition of things in the management of licensed houses.

*THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I hope your Lordships will not think I am taking too much upon myself if I intrude in this debate and say a few words upon this subject before we part altogether with the Bill. I took no part in the Second Reading of the Bill, and, for reasons which are known to your Lordships, it would probably not have been convenient if I had intervened at the Committee stage, and I will frankly admit that most of the experience which I can bring to bear upon this subject is derived from that country which is north of the Tweed, and does not enable me to speak with much confidence upon many of the intricate questions involved in the English licensing law. At the same time there are some, and not a few, general principles to be found in the legislation which Parliament has passed at various times upon this subject which are common to the countries both north and south of the Tweed.

The experience which I have had in this matter is this. I served for more than twenty years before the time I went into office as chairman of a licensing bench, and I had last year to consider the whole licensing law of Scotland on behalf of the Government. We succeeded in codifying it and making some important reforms. It seems to me that some sound general principles of wide application are infringed by this Bill, and as there is always a danger that things which are thought good for the country south of the Tweed may have a tendency to apply themselves, or to be applied, to the country north of the Tweed, I wish to put in a caveat and to say that from my experience of Scottish law, Scottish interests, and Scottish circumstances, there is hardly anything in this Bill which would be welcomed in Scotland.

It is claimed as a great measure of temperance reform, and I have no doubt whatever that in the opinion of His Majesty's Government it is a measure of temperance reform. But I hope before this debate concludes some one on behalf of the Government will give us a definite list of the points in the Bill which they consider as tending in the direction of temperance reform. Having paid some attention to the discussions which went on in Committee the other night, I can only think of two. One is the changed position which will be given to the ante-1869 beerhouses. That is a class of institution which, fortunately as I think, we do not know in Scotland, and I grant at once that it is a considerable measure of temperance reform that they will be to a large extent deprived, under proper safeguards and compensation, of the peculiar position of privilege which they have occupied up to this time. The second point tending in the direction of temperance reform in this Bill is the increased probability of a reduction of licences. That point has been challenged by the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London, by the noble Earl opposite, and by others; but I venture to say that, in my opinion, on that point the Government have made out a certain case under this Bill, and that for causes other than misconduct, there is a considerable prospect of, at any rate, some reduction of licences.

I do not desire to understate that matter, but to put it perfectly fairly. I think there is sometimes a tendency to lay too much stress on the probable effect of a reduction in the number of licences. We have all heard of the gentleman who can pass three public-houses but cannot pass the fourth. I venture to think that he is a somewhat mythical person. I believe that if a man passes three public-houses and goes into the fourth it is because he has some object in doing so. He either prefers the company he gets there or the beverages in the fourth establishment; and my belief is that so far as that class of person is concerned if you were to shut up the fourth public-house he would find his way into the third, and that if you shut up the third it is not improbable that he would find his way into the second. But there is a point in regard to the reduction of licences which I think important. The bad point about the excessive number of licences is the unhealthy competition which is created amongst the licence-holders for the custom of those who use the houses. Excessive competition is bad because it induces the provision of attractions, one house against the other, which, undoubtedly, do tend to the consumption of a greater amount of alcoholic liquor than would otherwise be consumed.

The noble Marquess the Leader of the House claimed great credit the other day for the Bill in that it would put an end to licences where they were redundant. The noble Lord who spoke last confirmed that, and added that this compensation will all come out of the pockets of the trade. To a certain extent it will; but one of the objections which I have to the Bill is that the method by which that compensation is taken and the privileges which are given in return for it are such as to put the public in a worse position after the Bill became law than they were before. The quotation which the noble Earl read to the House shows that the trade feel that even if this Bill passes in the form in which it is now before your Lordships, as it probably will, they as a trade can congratulate themselves upon having made a very good bargain in regard to this matter. Those are the two points, for what they are worth, on which I think the Government are justified in claiming this as a measure of temperance reform. I agree about the beer-houses altogether, and regard the other as too dearly bought.

I think the Government have made a mistake in not attempting in this Bill to attack the tied-house system. I believe that that system as it has grown up in this country is the bane of the whole trade and of the public. I believe that to no single cause is the present state of things due more than to the fact that these houses are the property of great brewery companies, and that the people who are actually concerned with their management are obliged by the position they occupy in regard to those brewery companies to push the sale of alcoholic liquors by all means in their power, fair and unfair, and feel that their prospects and chances in life depend on the amount of return which they transmit to those who are really their masters. I believe that the noble Lord who spoke last was perfectly right when he said that one of the great points to be looked at in this question of licences was not so much the number of houses which remained as the kind of management under which they are carried on. I believe that there is more to be done by a wise, healthy, scrupulous, and conscientious management of the houses and strict conformity not only with the letter but with the spirit of the law, than by the mere reduction of their number, and it is because I do not see in this Bill any sufficient premium for good management that I think a great opportunity has been lost by the Government. I know there is a clause in the Bill that there is to be refreshment at reasonable prices, but I venture to think it is not so much a question of whether there is to be a mutton chop for 6d. or a sausage roll for 2½d. as whether the general management of the establishment is to be satisfactory or whether there is an indirect compulsion put upon the taking of the strongest class of intoxicating liquors as contrasted with other beverages.

I deprecate greatly the interference with the discretion of the magistrates. I listened with great interest to what the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack said the other night, that this work was not in the strict sense of the term judicial work; but that it is administrative work which has to be done in a judicial spirit. In my opinion the maintenance of the absolute discretion of the Bench is the very keynote of all temperance reform. I do not believe you can get efficient work by hedging the Bench round with rules. You must put men on the Bench whom you can trust, and when they are there you must trust them. You must make them feel that they are responsible to the country for the action they take, and, if I may venture to say so, they must not be on a particular Bench in very large numbers. For this reason, the larger the number the less is the sense of direct personal responsibility. That was the principle upon which we went last year in Scotland, and although, as the noble Lord said, we allowed a considerable infusion of the elective element, we limited the numbers of our Bench very carefully, and I know that that reform has been accepted with gratitude by the trade and with absolute concurrence by those who are engaged in the work of temperance reform.

I do not venture to say that the reform of the Bench comes within the scope of this Bill. It does not. But who fixed the scope of the Bill? Who are responsible for that? I express my own personal opinion that if the Government had undertaken the reform of the Bench rather than a tinkering with their powers, their Bill would have had a more cordial reception and would have been likely to effect a great deal better work in the future. There can be no doubt of this, that the whole tenure of licences in England has been changed by this Bill. It will be a wholly different tenure after this Bill has passed from what it was before, and my objection to the change is that, in my humble opinion, it does not pave the way for that complete freedom to the public which will be the only final and permanent solution of this question. I go further and say I believe it will be an absolute obstacle in the way of that complete reform.

We all agree that some interest has grown up in the licence. No noble Lord has taken the extravagant and, as I think, the absurd position of saying that no interest exists, and that you can suddenly deprive the holders of licences of their interest, such as it is, without compensation. There is no doubt whatever that partly by custom, partly by the apathy of the public, partly by the practice of the Bench itself, a very material interest has been acquired, and it has been acknowledged and accepted and acted upon by the Inland Revenue authorities, who have taken duty upon it when it has been transferred from one holder to another by death. Both sides of the House have agreed to accept that reasonable position. I do not know whether your Lordships recollect the retort which was made by Mr. Bradlaugh to some of Mr. Henry George's theories. He is reported to have said that there are only two ways by which one man can acquire the property of another—one was by purchase and the other by stealing. There are only those ways, and you must either confiscate the property or give some fair form of recompense.

No one, I think, can really contend that the interest which has grown up is anything like a freehold interest; and I venture to say that the blot upon this Bill is that the interest has been put far too high, and that, in the future it will place in a far too greatly privileged position those who hold licences at the present time for the sale of intoxicating liquors. The noble Marquess the Lord Privy Seal said—

> "But you must remember that many people have invested their money in these licences, and to deprive them of what they have paid for would be pillage."

That is a strong term, and if it was proposed to absolutely deprive the holders of licences of the interest they had acquired I should agree, but I think it is put far too high. You cannot at this time of day protect adult men and women against wrong and improvident investments, and to apply such a term as "pillage" to any proposal that has been made in this House is to place the argument far too high.

I dislike the source of compensation which is provided by this Bill, and I dislike it because I see in it, I was going to say, no finality, but, if it has any finality, it is in the direction of making exceedingly difficult the absolute recovery of that freedom of dealing with licences which ought to be the whole end of temperance reform. I think that a time limit of sufficient duration, accompanied by a scheme of compulsory mutual insurance, would have been a sufficient solution of this difficulty. But if that was not sufficient —I am speaking only for myself, and I know that very few temperance reformers will agree with me—I would sooner have seen a fund established avowedly from national resources for the purpose of compensation, in order to secure to the public the complete freedom of dealing with licences without which no temperance reform can ever be complete. Having regard to the position of matters in Scotland, I do not think that the principles of this Bill could fairly be applied to that country, and I think it right to say so now, lest by my silence I might hereafter in this House or in Scotland be held to have tacitly passed for England, without having put in any caveat, a scheme which might be regarded as satisfactory for Scotland.

There are three or four very considerable differences in our position from that south of the Tweed. In the first place, our licence is granted to the person who actually carries on the business, and the owner of the premises is very little, if at all, recognised. The brewers and distillers are not recognised as owners of licences. I have not been actively connected with licensing matters in Scotland for the past decade, but up to ten years ago the Bench over which I presided made it their practice to warn licence-holders that if they tied themselves to any brewery or distillery the Bench would regard that as justifying the taking away of the licence. If that practice had been maintained in England it would have been better. As to the actual licence, when the interest which the holder has acquired in the goodwill, or whatever it may be, of the premises comes to be valued, it is carefully considered whether he is the tenant or the owner, and, if he is the tenant, what length of lease he possesses.

Every licence-holder must be in one of four classes. He may be either a tenant with a lease or a tenant without a lease, or he may be the owner and occupier or the owner and not the occupier. The Inland Revenue authorities in Scotland have not given away the case so completely as I am afraid has been the case in England. When a man is a tenant with no lease, it is very rarely that any duty is got by the Inland Revenue. If there has been a sale to the incoming tenant, or if the late tenant has recently bought, there is an effort to get at what he paid and something is taken, but generally the sale is conditional on the transfer of the licence being obtained. In the case where the man is a tenant under a lease his interest stands somewhat higher, and in the strongest case of all, when a man is both owner and occupier, a duty is got, but it is only obtained upon a very small calculation of the enhanced value.

I was looking through the state of the law last year and came across a recorded case in the Court of Session where there had been a contest between the Inland Revenue authorities and the owner of a licence as to the value of the goodwill. The case is that of the Lord Advocate on behalf of the Inland Revenue against the widow of a spirit merchant residing in Edinburgh. In that case the Inland Revenue claimed £3,000 or five times the annual value of the goodwill, which they put at £600. The owner of the licence contested both the number of years purchase and the value put upon the goodwill, and after consultation and the showing of figures an agreement was come to—it was not a decision by the Court but an agreement between parties ratified by the Court—fixing an annual value of £200 for the goodwill; but what was the gross sum paid? It was only £500, or two-and-half years purchase. That shows at once that if anything in the nature of this Bill was to be applied to Scotland we should be in an infinitely worse position than we are at the present time.

I feel that I owe your Lordships an apology for having entered upon this discussion. It is a matter on which, so far as England is concerned, I have no practical or personal experience, but I am apprehensive that an attempt may be made to extend the general principles of this Bill to Scotland, and I wish to take this opportunity of showing, not only that there is a difference in the circumstances of the two countries, but that it would be an act of gross injustice to apply the principles of this Bill to the country north of the Tweed.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, considering that my noble friend who had just sat down did not vote against the Second Reading of the Bill, and proposed no Amendments on the Report stage, when the disabilitity to which he had called attention would not have attached to him, I think we might have been rather surprised at the tenor of his speech but for one consideration. I have always observed that when an Assembly such as your Lordships' House is addressed by a Member hailing from north of the Tweed, it is always necessary for them to listen to the observation, couched in very elaborate terms, but always to the same effect—"We are not as other men." And, my Lords, I think my noble friend's speech was an elaborate extension of that ancient phrase. He asked us, however, to state to him and to the House what were the improvements in temperance legislation which we claim to have effected by this Bill. Even as he himself related them, I think your Lordships will agree that the improvements were by no means inconsiderable. But his enumeration was not complete.

When he was making this elaborate attack upon the provisions of the Bill, my noble friend absolutely omitted to notice all the provisions which have reference to new licences. That was a very astonishing omission. I admit that in regard to existing licences the Government have felt themselves restricted by their feeling of obligation to acknowledge that pecuniary interest in their licences which existing licensees, by the admission of my noble friend, possess. But with regard to new licences we were not hampered, and in respect of new licences by far the greatest change in the law in respect of temperance legislation is to be found. We have done our best to make it impossible henceforward for the monopoly value of the liquor trade to belong to anybody else but the State. As to the precise application of the money which will arise from the monopoly value of the new licences, we have had a good deal of discussion upon that in Committee and on the Report stage. We were able to make a very important concession to independent Members of your Lordships' House, and I think it will be agreed that, whatever may be the ultimate shape which that Amendment assumes, we have at any rate done this, we have removed from the legislation of this country that very gross provision by which Parliament gives to private individuals, with the licences, the monopoly value of the drink, to which they have no claim, to the detriment of the community. That is, I think, a very important element in the list which my noble friend entirely forgot.

Then there are the ante-1869 beerhouses. My noble friend mentioned them, but only in order to convey the information to your Lordships that in that blessed country north of the Tweed there are no ante-1869 beerhouses. I congratulate my noble friend. It makes the task of dealing with Scotland, of course, easier; but I do not think that detracts from our merit in having dealt with the problem south of the Tweed. When your Lordships remember that one-third of the whole of the licensed houses south of the Tweed are ante-1869 beerhouses, and that for the first time they become by this Bill subject to the ultimate control of the magistrates of this country, so that they can, if necessary, be suppressed, I think your Lordships will admit that that constitutes a very large item to be placed to the credit side of the account when estimating what good for temperance this Bill will effect.

Then there is the reduction of licences. My noble friend mentioned that, but with a good deal of criticism. Other noble Lords have minimised the merit of that provision, because they have said that the number of public-houses which we propose to reduce will be very few. I do not propose to go over the ground which was discussed on the other stages of the Bill, nor do I propose to repeat what my noble friend Lord Belper has just said, but I would like to remind your Lordships of this, that when we have mentioned the number of licensed houses which can be suppressed under this Bill, we have nearly always spoken of the money available as an annual sum. But if quarter sessions or the great municipalities are anxious to move more quickly they can capitalise the annual sum to the extent permitted by the Amendment inserted at the last stage, namely, for fifteen years. The money can be so capitalised with the consent of the Home Secretary, and that will produce in London alone an enormous sum, and enable an immediate enormous reduction in the number of licensed houses. That is a method of dealing with this subject which I think your Lordships will agree to a large extent meets the criticism of the right rev. Prelate that very little is done under the Bill. You will have a sum which I calculate will be at least £2,500,000 if the full fifteen years term of borrowing is permitted, with which the licensed houses can be immediately reduced within a few months after the passing of this Bill. I hope it may be some comfort to the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London that, after all, he will not find the Bill so useless as he imagines. But my noble friend who has just sat down is still dissatisfied with what the Bill can effect. He forgot the great facilities which will be given by this Bill to my noble friend Earl Grey to carry out his system of licensing reform. I suppose that does not interest our friends north of the Tweed.

*Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: I beg the noble Marquess's pardon. I happen to be President of the trust in Scotland which is working the same scheme.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I am very glad to find that there is one particular in which Scotland is content to be taught by England. It is rather wonderful to hear the example of Scotland trotted out in temperance discussions. Though perhaps in most respects Scotland is far better than England—I have no doubt my noble friend would assure us it was so—yet in temperance matters Scotsmen have fallen a little behind their friends south of the Tweed, and perhaps the difference of our licensing law may have had something to do with it. It does not follow necessarily that because the licensing law in Scotland differs from the licensing law in England we stand in a worse position than the sister kingdom. My noble friend, however, said he would have preferred that we had established a national fund, contributed by the ordinary taxpayers, with which we might have bought out all the interests in licensed premises. That is not a proposal which, I think, at the present moment would have successfully been made to my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but, as a matter of fact, there is nothing whatever in our Bill, when it becomes law, to prevent my noble friend or noble Lords opposite, if they have the control of the Government of this country, from establishing such a national fund. Let them, by all means—it will not be inconsistent with our Bill—come to Parliament and ask for powers to collect the taxes with the view of buying out the interest of publicans. That would undoubtedly produce much more rapid results than we shall be able to obtain under this Bill, but I doubt very much whether noble Lords opposite will take that course, and I very much doubt whether my noble friend will be in a position to propose it.

Therefore, my Lords, we must come back to the Government Bill, and the principles on which it is worked. We think that it is calculated to carry out a great many temperance reforms. We do not agree with my noble friend's condemnation of the tied-house system. We see no reason to pronounce this condemnation *ex cathedra* of that system. The Majority Report of the Royal Commission states that there is a great deal to be said for the tied-house system. I do not say that if we had to start completely afresh we might not invent something better, but where the tied-house system is in the hands of good brewers, the Majority Report found that it was not a bad system but a good system, and that the large brewers used their influence, not for mischief, but in order to do good to the community. I respectfully protest against this unmeasured, this unlimited condemnation of a perfectly respectable body of men.

My noble friend said there was nothing in our Bill for good management. I imagine he has not noticed that the amount of compensation which will be awarded to the publican if his licence is suppressed depends on good management. In the ordinary case of a publican whose tenure is a year or less than a year, the amount the publican will get out of the compensation money will depend on his good conduct. Is that not a provision in the interests of good management? Then my noble friend, having attacked His Majesty's Government, made a general attack on all the magistrates south of the Tweed.

*Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: Will the noble Marquess quote my words?

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I understood the noble Lord to say that what we had to do was not to think so much about public-houses but to reform the Bench. I happen to have the great honour of being a magistrate myself, as has nearly every one of your Lordships, and I utterly repudiate the idea that we are unfit for our work in this respect. Why should the noble Lord say so? Why should he think so? What interest have we, the magistrates, to do anything but our duty in regard to the licensing law? For myself, I believe that the changes in the law in our Bill with respect to the magistrates are for good. They do not limit their powers—in some respects they extend their powers; and as quarter sessions will necessarily include the best magistrates of a county, we may expect from them a still further improvement in the administration of the licensing law.

I will say one word with regard to the speech of the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition. He regretted the Bill, and he regretted more than the Bill the method by which it had been carried. I share with him that regret. I think it is a profound pity that the Parliamentary machine does not seem to work as well as it used to. I have been seventeen years in the House of Commons, and I have some experience of the reason and causes of these things. It does not, perhaps, become a Member of your Lordships' House to make criticisms on the methods of business in another place; but I may say this, that if the object of those who discuss a Bill is not merely to improve it, but also to break the Government programme for the session, then you will never get a Bill properly discussed whatever your rules or constitution may be. That being so, it is not surprising that the Bill should have come up to your Lordships with so many of its provisions not properly submitted to the other House of Parliament.

Earl SPENCER: The noble Marquess is alleging what I should describe as pure obstruction, but the Prime Minister absolutely stated on one occasion that he did not consider there had been any obstruction in the Amendments which had been put down and in the discussion which had taken place on the Bill in the other House.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I think we had better avoid epithets. I will not call it anything. All I say is, that if there is not a desire to amend the Bill, but an unavowed desire to make the progress of Government business difficult, and to break the session, you will never get a Bill properly discussed. I was very careful, knowing that these debates in your Lordships' House were impending, to carefully read everything that was said in the other House. I find that nearly all, if not all, the important points in this Bill were in fact discussed, not necessarily upon the specific clauses or lines where they arise in the Bill, but in the course of the various discussions upon the Bill. I have only one word more to say, and it is to thank the most rev. Primate for the great moderation of his speech this evening. I do not think he ever could have entertained the hope that the Government would accept the time limit which he proposed. But I recognise that the time limit having been rejected, it is, if I may say so with great respect, exceedingly creditable to him that he should be able to speak so well of the Bill. He has told your Lordships that though he does not agree with the Bill, though his opposition to it remains, yet he intends to do his utmost to make it work well, and that, I think, is a sentiment which every one of your Lordships will approve. I hope that the light which we have been able to throw on the provisions of the Bill in another place, and in your Lordships' House, may have led some noble Lords who were originally opposed to the Bill, to take a more charitable view of it, and to share with the Government the hope, nay, the expectation, that some good to temperance may at last be effected.

*__The LORD BISHOP of LONDON__: My Lords, I only rise to say one word before the Bill is read a third time and passed. The critics of the Bill have been reinforced by the speech of Lord Balfour, who is one of the most level-headed and fairest-minded Members of your Lordships' House. There is an old saying about erring with Plato; there are many subjects on which I would rather be beaten with Lord Balfour than win with many another. In reference to what has been said about my figures, I presume that I may scrutinise carefully the string by which any attraction hangs which is held out to me. It was the Colonial Secretary who held out the attraction that the public-houses of London would be reduced 25 per cent., the string by which it hung was the estimate of £3,000 per licence. I was perfectly justified then in taking this as the estimate. Put this £3,000 into the £5,565,000 and it gives the exact number I mentioned, 1855. My figures, therefore, have by no means been shaken by any criticism. Let me add, however, in the spirit of the most rev. Primate, that if more public-houses are closed than I expect under the Bill, no one will be more glad than I. Though I have opposed the Bill, as I think your Lordships will agree it was my duty to do, I, too, will do my best to work the Bill in London. If it does more good than I expect, I shall be very glad indeed.

On Question, Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

NAVAL ADMINISTRATION.

Lord BRASSEY rose to call attention to the programme of shipbuilding for the Navy. He said: My Lords, British naval administration has reached a high standard of efficiency, due to the efforts of a long succession of able Ministers—to my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition, Lord Spencer, and to-day to the First Lord, aided as he has been by his naval colleagues, and especially by Lord Walter Kerr, now retiring full of honours from active service. The Navy must always call for the supervision of Parliament. The Estimates for 1904–5 have reached an amount unprecedented in time of peace—in round figures £37,000,000 under Estimates; £5,000,000 for naval works. Are reductions possible under any heads of charge? The Votes for manning have increased in ten years from £5,400,000 to £9,100,000. A voluntary service must be costly, and our numbers have been increased in ten years from 86,103 to 131,100 men.

Compare our permanent force with that of other naval Powers—France, 50,000; Germany, 34,000; United States, 45,000 men. Our permanent force is too large and our Reserves are too few. It is an agreeable duty to acknowledge the successful efforts of the Admiralty to strengthen the Reserves. With stronger Reserves we might have more power of expansion with less expenditure. Some economy is possible in our training service. We have too many boys in harbour ships. The Admiralty have wisely decided to reduce the number. Boys entered at an older age in seagoing training ships have done well. The aggregate Estimates for naval works, as proposed under the Bill of 1895, were under £9,000,000. The total has now advanced to £27,500,000. It can hardly be contended that all the new works are of urgent necessity. Take as an example the estimate of £3,500,000 for Simon's Bay. Here, certainly, there was a case of over-lapping. Our commercial base at Cape Town, with all its resources in docks and skilled workmen, was close at hand, and must be strongly held. With a subsidy from the Admiralty the Cape Government would have provided new docks or enlarged existing docks, and at less cost. New docks for the Navy entail a permanent addition to expenditure. They are useless without workmen, who must be paid at the Cape at Colonial rates. Parliament should be more vigilant in examining all new proposals, more especially for works in distant parts of the world.

Turning to the Votes for shipbuilding, their amount has increased from under £9,000,000 in 1895 to £18,420,000 for 1904–5. The increase has been necessary to maintain the two-Power standard in shipbuilding. For the years 1895–1904 the aggregate outlay for construction was officially given by the Secretary to the Admiralty at £70,000,000 in round figures for Great Britain, as against £83,000,000 for France, Russia, and Germany. We must look for reductions in future years. The shipbuilding Votes for the present year have been abnormally increased by the purchase of the "Swiftsure" and "Triumph." We have now reached a total of no less than £12,000,000, or more than the shipbuilding Votes of France, Russia, and Germany. And we build at least 25 per cent.—in a case lately given in a French official report, 44 per cent.—more cheaply than is possible in Russia or in France. By the efforts of recent years our naval supremacy is, for the time at least, assured. We are the better able to follow other Powers in a policy of retrenchment. It is useless to spend large sums on shipbuilding unless we have some expectation that the costly ships we lay down will be retained for a reasonable time on the list of effectives.

As to types, our naval architects fully hold their own. Our first-class battleships, whether designed by Sir William White or Mr. Watts, are not surpassed in any foreign navy. The rivalry of constructors under peace conditions tends towards exaggeration of size. The cost has advanced for the eight ships of the "Edward VII." class—and doubtless for the "Nelson," our latest design—to no less than £1,500,000. As the cost increases the numbers which can be built for any given sum must be less, and superiority in numbers must tell. That was the lesson of the Great War. The fleets of Lord Nelson consisted chiefly of 74's. At Trafalgar there were no four-deckers in the British line of battle. Superiority in numbers is even more important in modern naval warfare. The largest ships are as vulnerable below the belt as those of less dimensions. Size gives no immunity from the risks of stranding, collision, and fog. We are bound to build ships equal to the most powerful in foreign navies, but we need a less costly type. The "Swiftsure" and "Triumph," designed by Sir Edward Reed, lately purchased into the Navy at a cost per ship of £950,000, combining as they do the fighting power of battleships and the speed and coal endurance of cruisers, should find a place in future programmes. They could be built in the proportion of three to two of our largest types.

I have no criticisms to offer as to cruisers. I congratulate the Admiralty on their policy of cutting out vessels of no value for naval purposes. We built too many in times past. For the protection of commerce in distant seas and along the ocean routes our largest cruisers are the most satisfactory. Scouts are necessary. They are the eyes of the fleet. In the olden days the scouts were the frigates, of which Lord Nelson never had enough. Last year four vessels of the new type, officially designated as "scouts," were laid down. In the programme of 1904–5 we have four more vessels of the same class. The scouts are to steam twenty-five knots on an eight hours trial. The speed is high, but the displacements are too small to carry the supply of coal required in vessels designed to sweep the ocean. The scouts can hardly be reckoned as fighting vessels. They cannot compare with cruisers in armament; they are without protection. They will break up in a few minutes under a heavy fire; and their complements number 268 officers and men. Vessels of the scout type could, of course, chase destroyers, but no vessels have as yet been designed as effective as destroyers for repelling torpedo attacks upon a fleet of battleships. The greater the superiority in numbers the more complete the defence. Destroyers cost £50,000; scouts little less than £300,000. I would urge that no more vessels of the scout class should be laid down until those in hand have been tried at sea.

The scout class is not an untried type. In the years 1896–1900 twelve third-class cruisers of the "Pelrous" class, similar in dimensions to the scouts, and designed for similar services, were laid down. They had a speed of twenty knots. Their coal endurance was insufficient for scouting. It was soon seen that the "Pelorus" class must be failures. Lord Goschen's criticisms, in introducing the Navy Estimates on the 26th February, 1900, apply with equal force to the scouts—

> "Then there is another point," he said, "connected with the programme of last year, namely, that we have dropped our proposal to lay down three third-class cruisers of rather larger dimensions than the 'Pelorus' class, intended to be very fast, and designed for special purposes We were guided in the matter to a certain extent by the experience of other countries. France had also intended to lay down some very fast small cruisers, but the French naval architects like our own appear to have found the task impossible to perform, and the French Government have withdrawn the small third-class cruisers from their programme just as we have dropped them from ours. The attempt was to put an enormous amount of machinery within a vessel of very small dimensions. That has been accomplished in the torpedo destroyers. They are light and very delicate instruments; but when we came to try it on a larger scale it was thought that these third-class cruisers would only be torpedo destroyers on a larger scale, and that they would not have the necessary sea-going or fighting power, and, therefore, it was thought better not to embark on an ambitious attempt which, though it would result in the appearance of a great success, might turn out to be impracticable in war.

It would seem scarcely necessary to build special vessels as scouts. In the third class we have many cruisers no longer effective for the protection of commerce which should be effective for scouting duties. They have a speed of twenty knots, and a coal capacity far superior to that of the scouts. Their speed might be considerably increased by reducing armaments. As the eyes of the Fleet, no regularly built vessels of war can compare with the greyhounds of the mercantile marine. They were strongly recommended to the Committee on Subsidies by Lord Charles Beresford. In giving evidence before the Committee he said—

> "In war the mercantile marine and the Royal Navy must be to a very great extent intermingled. In allowing your admirals a certain number of very fast merchant ships by way of auxiliaries to the Fleet you may save a campaign and you may win an initial advantage. These ships would form the line of communication. They would carry information to an admiral of the movements of an enemy's fleet. There is no ship that can do this service better than the ocean greyhounds that are built for speed in any weather. That is their utility."

Lord Charles Beresford gave suggestions as to the means by which the construction of such vessels should be encouraged by the aid of the Government, and the ships retained under the British flag. There are strong political arguments in favour of a policy of subsidies to auxiliary vessels as the scouts of the Fleet. Swift communications are a bond of Empire. It is satisfactory to know that some definite conclusion has been reached on the subject of boilers. As to repairs, large sums have been wasted in the past in repairs to ships of no value for naval purposes. The remedy is to put such vessels out of commission. I congratulate the Admiralty on the strength of the Fleet in ships, and in officers and men inspired by their traditions and always eager to do their duty.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I agree with the greater part of what has fallen from the noble Lord who has just spoken, especially with regard to what he has said about the construction of smaller battleships. Large battleships take so long to build that in all probability a modern war would be over before new ships could be built to replace the losses that we are certain to incur. In addition to our losses during fleet actions, balanced it is to be hoped by equal losses on the part of the enemy, we may fairly expect that those sub-aqueous explosions which are playing so large a part in the Russo-Japanese war will from time to time still further reduce the numbers of our first-class ships. Under modern conditions of warfare, however successful we may be, we are unlikely to be able to replace these vessels by captures, and we shall, therefore, in all probability emerg from the war, or find ourselves in the middle of it, with fewer line-of-battle ships than we began with, a position that we have never yet been in, a position which will place us at a disadvantage, especially if we find ourselves face to face with unfriendly neutral Powers.

I therefore suggest that the Naval Construction Department should now, in time of peace, design, but not build, a small type of heavily armed battleship, two of which should be superior to one first-class battleship. The ruling principle of their construction should be that it should be possible to build them quickly, so that several of the class could be put out to contract at the commencement of war with a reasonable prospect of their being finished in time to be of use. The expense of preparing such a design would amount to a few hundred pounds only, and if this were done, a small fleet of such vessels would be ready for sea some months sooner than would be the case if the drawings had to be thought out, and the ships designed, before the actual work of building could be commenced. The noble Earl has given us his peace programme of naval construction, but I hope that he either has, or soon will have, a war programme of ships, with designs completed and drawn to scale, ready to be put in hand the moment that such a misfortune occurs. I do not, however, wish to ask him for the details of that programme. I think that it is better that they should remain in the category of State secrets.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, I will take the opportunity afforded me by my noble friend of dealing with one or two of those points of naval administration which have formed the subject of debate elsewhere during the session. I admit that I am glad of the opportunity of speaking on them; for I have not the privilege of defending the Estimates for which I am responsible in another place, and it is only such opportunities as this occasion affords me which enable me to defend the policy of the Board for which I am responsible. In the first place, the great size of the Navy Estimates has attracted a great deal of attention and a good deal of adverse comment. I am responsible, of course, principally for the Navy, but I also, as a Cabinet Minister, share to the full the responsibility of my colleagues for the state of the finances, and I am glad of this opportunity of saying that in my opinion a sound condition of finance is as important to the strength and well-being of this country as the sound condition of the Navy.

I would say that the Navy and our national credit are the two pillars on which in every material sense the safety of this Empire depends. The fabric of the Empire is built up by the character of our people and our national industries; the maintenance of that fabric depends upon our finances and upon the Navy together. If the Navy is weak, our national credit never can be assured; if our national finance is not in a thoroughly sound condition; if we have not a margin on which to fall back in time of emergency, then proper provision cannot be made for the Navy. Therefore, I am the last person to complain of the criticism which is being levelled against the size of the Navy Estimates. The responsibility for the justification rests upon me and upon my Board. Now, an offer was made a year or two ago by Lord Goschen, and repeated by my right hon. friend Mr. Ritchie, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, that if other nations would agree to diminish the rate of shipbuilding we would not be slow in acknowledging their lead and joining them in that movement. That offer has never been withdrawn. But the conditions of the case are more complicated and difficult now than they were a few years ago.

A few years ago it would have been sufficient if France and the United Kingdom had agreed mutually to diminish expenditure on shipbuilding, for in those days there were only two really great Navies—the Navies of France and the United Kingdom; but now the case is entirely changed, and there are more than half-a-dozen great naval Powers, some of them pressing on shipbuilding from year to year; and neither France nor the United Kingdom, however anxious they might be to curtail the rate of naval expenditure, could do so without considering the expenditure of other countries as well as their own mutual expenditure. What is the standard at which successive Governments have endeavoured to maintain our naval strength? It has always been called the two-Power standard. Now I have looked back through the records of discussions on the subject in both Houses for some years, and I find that the date at which this standard may be said to have met with general acceptance was when Lord George Hamilton was First Lord of the Admiralty; and it is to that standard successive Governments have since worked.

Now what Lord George Hamilton really meant, and what the House of Commons meant, was that we should be prepared to face any two naval Powers with a reasonable probability of success. That was what the standard meant; and in those days the two next naval Powers were France and Italy, and as Italy was very friendly disposed towards us no one was anxious about the naval programme of Italy. The standard was convenient so far as battleships went, and it was possible to work to it, always bearing in mind that the strength should offer reasonable probability of victory, and that it should not be a mere arithmetical comparison. It has been a convenient standard for battleships; but in respect to cruisers and torpedo craft the standard has never had a real application, because the strength there must be in proportion to the work the Navy has to perform; and it has never been possible to assess that in proportion to the cruisers and torpedo craft of the next two naval Powers. Our Board of Admiralty has before it a totally different naval problem from any which any other naval authority has to consider. The Admiralty of another country can concentrate its efforts on producing a formidable fleet of battleships, or it may make a leading feature of its strength cruisers to prey on the commerce of this or any other country with which that country might be at war, or it might direct its attention in other directions, such as the creation of a formidable *Défence Mobile.*

But this country has to consider much more. No other Admiralty in the world has to consider its Navy as the one safeguard of the country from invasion, or the fact that on the Navy depends the supply of food to the people. No other nation has to accept the responsibility of safeguarding so far as it may a vast preponderating ocean commerce or the shores of an Empire spread over continents and islands in all parts of the world. Our Navy is responsible for the safety of the whole Empire, to ensure reasonable immunity from invasion or raid. When you consider that is not an exaggerated statement of the functions the Board of Admiralty has to consider, I think I shall carry your Lordships with me when I say you cannot compare with any reason or fairness the naval expenditure of this country with that of any two or more Powers, because what our Navy has to do is totally different from what the navies of any one, two, or three other Powers have to do. There is an essential difference in the problem. And, although I welcome financial criticism and fully feel the importance of financial considerations, and agree that naval expenditure ought to be carefully scrutinised from the financial point of view, yet I do altogether deprecate a comparison of our naval expenditure with the naval expenditure of any two or three other naval Powers as the standard or basis of criticism.

It seems to me that it is quite possible to say that this country shall maintain a certain naval standard whatever the expenditure may be; that is quite possible, it has been quite possible, but it may cease to be possible in times to come. Or it is possible to say that the country will spend so much money and the Navy shall be as strong as it is possible to produce for that money. The country can take either of these courses. But what the Admiralty should not agree to accept is the responsibility of keeping up to a standard for which the money provided would not suffice. It is for the nation to decide whether at a given moment finance or the Navy is the more important, but do not attempt to deceive the nation by stating you are maintaining a standard when you have not asked for the money to do it. Lord Brassey has admitted in criticising the details of our shipbuilding policy that we must build battleships the most powerful that are built, and there is no difference of opinion between us there. He also said we ought to build a less costly type of battleship, that we should have two standards of battleships, battleships that are the most powerful and others less powerful; and there I differ from him. I do not see why we should spend money on comparatively inferior battleships. Time is automatically supplying comparatively inferior battleships, and why the Admiralty should hasten that automatic process and build ships which a generation hence will be still more out of date than those we have now I fail to see.

Now there must not be exaggeration about the way battleships pass out of date. Some misconception has been caused in this matter owing to the fact that our muzzle-loading ships are now out of date; but the same thing will not apply to breech-loading battleships. I take the "Nile" and "Trafalgar" as dating from the time of which Lord Brassey spoke. They are still valuable battleships of the second line, valuable reserve battleships, and I believe the battleships we are building now will be valuable battleships for the reserve line twenty-five years hence. Lord Ellenborough made a useful suggestion that we should have in reserve war designs upon which ships could be more quickly built than modern ships can be. I will give the suggestion careful consideration, but I may point out that the difficulty in building battleships is not with the hull or armour; it is with the machinery and more particularly with the gun-mountings. It is the gun-mounting that limits the speed of construction. If gun-mountings could be turned out with the same speed as the hull then I think, given certain circumstances and the crisis, the time occupied in producing a battleship could be materially shortened.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: I know that was the case once, but I thought we had got over it.

* **THE EARL OF SELBORNE**: No. The number of places where gun-mountings can be supplied are very limited. Armstrong and Vickers are the only firms in this country, I think, where the big gun-mountings are made, and, apart from the capacity of these two firms to turn out gun-mountings, the process itself is exceedingly slow and complicated. One word on the "Lord Nelson" type of battleship mentioned in another place the other day. We have endeavoured to avoid increasing the displacement. We have put on that displacement a very powerful armament—an armament of four 12-inch guns and ten 9·2 guns, and the speed will be the same as in all the later battleships, a little over eighteen knots. The cost is roughly a little more than that of the "King Edward" class. I regard that displacement and those proportions as about the limit which we are likely to reach, because if the displacement is largely increased you limit the number of ports and docks the vessel can use and the general utility of the ship is decreased.

I take this opportunity of deprecating the kinds of methods that are used in comparing our battleships or cruisers with the battleships and cruisers of other nations. It often appears that writers in newspapers and magazines forget that every warship is a compromise. It is an essential element that it should be a compromise; one feature is predominant in one ship, another feature will be found in another. No ship combines every feature in its highest degree. I saw the other day an instance of what I mean. When the German squadron was at Devonport I saw in one paper a review of their characteristics, and the conclusion of the writer was that this fleet of eight battleships was more powerful than either the Channel Fleet or the Home Fleet. I am not going to discuss here the comparative merits of our own individual fleets and the corresponding foreign fleets, but what I want to draw attention to is the process by which this conclusion was arrived at. There was a very inadequate examination of any of the qualities of the ships possessed by either the Germans or the British except the number of guns; and the whole of the argument was really based on the fact that, speaking broadly, each of these German ships carried eighteen 6-inch guns, whereas twelve was the number carried in the British ships.

Anybody who did not know the subject might have read that article from end to end and never would have guessed this somewhat important fact—that, whereas every ship of the Channel Fleet had four 12-inch guns—that is, thirty-two 12-inch guns in the Fleet—and four ships of the Home Fleet had four 13½-inch guns each, two others four 12-inch guns each, and two others four 10-inch guns each, there was not a single gun in the whole of the German Fleet above 9·4-inch in calibre. That was to say, the Channel Fleet had thirty-two 12-inch guns against thirty-two 9·4-inch guns of the German Fleet, and our Home Fleet had sixteen 13½-inch guns, eight 12-inch guns, and eight 10-inch guns against the thirty-two 9·4-inch guns of the German fleet. It is therefore of no assistance to the comparison of naval architecture to approach the subject in that kind of exceedingly unscientific spirit. Lord Brassey has so kindly expressed his concurrence with the policy of the armoured cruisers that I will only repeat the information given in another place, that the new class of armoured cruisers—the "Minotaur" class—will carry an armament of 9·2 guns and 7½-inch guns and steam at twenty-three knots.

I now come to a class which has been a great deal criticised by Lord Brassey and in the Press—what is known as the "Scout" class. It has been said that they are wanting in coal endurance and that as destroyers they are too large. Now, is their coal endurance inadequate for the duties which they have been created to perform? Remember the Admiralty in one sense made an experiment. We desired to give the great firms in this country an opportunity of showing what they could produce, given certain conditions, without the initiative of the Director of Naval Construction, and we went to four of the leading firms and said, "This is the kind of ship we want; make your own design." Each of the four firms supplied two of the scouts. They differ somewhat in characteristics, but, roughly, this is their average coal endurance: At 12 knots, 2,500 nautical miles; at 20 knots, 1,000 nautical miles;

and at 25 knots, 600 nautical miles. I must not be understood to say that that is a test, because they are only tried for eight hours at 25 knots, and it would not be fair to say that they were always able to do continuous sea steaming at 25 knots for 600 miles, but the coal they carry would suffice for that distance at that speed.

There never was any idea of creating the scout class as destroyers of destroyers. They have been given armament to enable them to fight the only vessels fast enough to catch them, which are the destroyers; but the genesis of this class was the desire to meet the demands of the admirals commanding the manœuvring fleets. None of the old unarmoured cruisers or mercantile auxiliaries could come up to the speed of 25 knots on emergencies like the scouts, and cruisers are more expensive ships. We have to hand a case where the scouts would in my estimation be of great value. Admiral Togo would indeed be gratified if he had some of these vessels at his disposal. It would be improper for me to discuss a war between two friendly Powers, but the general situation to which I may refer is known to the whole world. There is a port in which there is a powerful fleet, and another powerful fleet lies at a considerable distance from that port ready to move at a moment's notice, and it relies for its information on scouts lying off the blockaded port. The whole issue of a war might depend on any admiral in a similar position getting information early enough of any movement of the fleet in the blockaded port. For such a purpose I can imagine nothing better adapted than the scout class.

I should like to refer to the submarine class, although it was not mentioned by Lord Brassey. Public attention was lately riveted on the submarine by the deplorable accident which happened off Portsmouth to Submarine A 1. In the opinion of the Admiralty, the value of submarines for defensive purposes is abundantly proved, and for offensive defence—the defence, for example, of our shores in the case of attempted invasion—they are a great addition to our national security. What further development may be in store for this class of ship I am not prepared to say. I am certainly not prepared to say we have reached the limit of the uses to which experience may show they can be put. I hope the public will not think they are dangerous to officers and men. I do not believe that the risks of navigating this class are in any kind different from those involved in the navigation of torpedo boats or destroyers, which at night or in crowded waters must always run a certain amount of risk, and I think the increase in degree practically *nil*. The safety of the submarine, as of the torpedo boat, depends on the nerve and skill of the officers. That is the opinion of the Board of Admiralty, and I am allowed by the parent of an officer now serving in a submarine, who is himself in a position to speak authoritatively on all naval questions, which he follows with keen interest, to say that this accurately describes the state of the case. All proper precautions should always be used. Manœuvres must continue; but every opportunity should be taken to warn the mercantile marine where these submarines are at work.

One word on the question of boilers. Two years ago, referring to Belleville boilers, I said that if properly manufactured and if properly managed they were able to fulfil the requirements of the Navy, and would not fail in time of war on those conditions. All that has happened since has confirmed me in that opinion, but it has also confirmed me in the opinion which I then added, that this boiler is too delicate an instrument for the rough-and-tumble work of the Navy. That is my firm conviction now. But although the ships which have Belleville boilers have not failed their admirals, I regret to say that the cost of the repairs of these boilers has been very serious indeed, and I should never myself be responsible for putting in any more of these boilers, not because I think they would fail in a time of emergency, but because I think they are too expensive to the taxpayers of the country. The boilers which the Committee finally recommended, and which the Admiralty have adopted, are much simpler in construction and much easier to examine and keep in order; and the Admiralty have good reason to believe that they will cost far less in repairs than the Belleville boilers. But I must protest against a phrase which was used in another place, that the Admiralty have recklessly turned the Navy into a gigantic experiment in the matter of boilers. We had, of course, experiments on a large scale, because in no other way could we find out what was the best boiler for the Navy. But we have not put into one single ship of the Navy any boiler which we did not believe would serve that ship faithfully in time of war.

As to the cost of naval works. I am well aware how serious is the sum which Parliament has authorised to be expended on these works. But the reason of this great expenditure is that these naval works have been neglected for nearly two generations. If Parliament had, from year to year during the last half century, done what was necessary, this great expenditure in the last ten years to overtake arrears would not have been necessary. I submit that all that has transpired in the present war shows how essential it is that the Navy should be equipped with these works. In a naval war a country may have the ships and the men, but if she has no place where the ships can be repaired, renovated, and sent to sea again, she may well be defeated by an enemy with an inferior force but provident enough to have provided her navy with all those works so essentially necessary to keep a fleet in being in modern naval warfare. The whole of the expenditure on naval works has been of two classes—in providing proper accommodation for the men of the Fleet either in barracks or hospitals, and for the ships of the Fleet in docks, with the workshops by which they can be repaired, and in providing harbours where they can repair, refit, revictual, or recoal without molestation; and I do not believe that any one of these provisions has been ill-advised. I cannot admit what Lord Brassey said about Simon's Bay. Simon's Bay is a very important spot in the Empire, from the point of view of naval strategy. If the Suez Canal were closed, it would be difficult to exaggerate its importance, and when Lord Goschen's Board agreed to the spending of this large sum of money on works in Simon's Bay, I have no doubt but that they adopted the plan which would give the Navy what was required in the most efficient way, and with the least expense.

What are the great lessons which are taught by the present war? The first is the importance of the *personnel*. The officers and the men are of more importance than the ships, and that is the greatest justification of the policy of the Admiralty in years past in asking Parliament to provide us with so large a number of active service ratings. There must, of course, be a limit to the expansion of the active service ratings. Further expansion must be in the Reserve; and the Admiralty have done their best to increase the Reserves not merely at home but in the Colonies. Lord Goschen's Board started the way in Newfoundland; we have followed in the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand, and Malta. In addition to that, we have started the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve. It is too soon to speak of how it has turned out, but I can say that it promises well. The second lesson which I deduce from the war is that we must have a margin of strength. It is plain, I think, to those who have followed the war how much turns on the existence or non-existence of a margin of strength; and I am quite sure that those who realise what a naval war must mean to this country know that the two-Power standard, properly interpreted, means a reasonable assurance of victory, and that reasonable assurance of victory predicates a margin over strict numerical equality. The question is sometimes asked, have the experiences of this war shown that battleships are out of date? Have the mine and the torpedo relegated the battleship from the leading place it has occupied ever since modern naval war began? I believe that nothing could be further from the truth. No lesson is more surely written across the pages of the history of the present war, so far as it has progressed, than that without the battleship no Power can hold or win the command of the sea. I do not ask you to take this opinion from me. I will conclude by reading an extract from an article by Captain Mahan in the *New York Sun* of 11th May this year, on the question of the survival of the battleship, viz.—

> "Power so concentrated, if equally well handled, will always prevail—not only against an equal amount, but even against a decidedly superior amount dispersed among several. This is elementary military experience; appearing in another form in the commonly understood virtues of central position, interior lines, massed forces, and single command. This is, in brief,

The Earl of Selborne.

the argument for the battleship; single and concentrated force. There is further the utterly unappreciated, in fact wholly ignored, factor of economy. It is much more expensive to put the same aggregate tonnage into two ships than into one. Speaking within limits, you get less military efficiency at higher cost. You need two captains for one; nearly twice as many officers; and crews which, while they may not be the double of the one ship, will exceed it by a very large percentage. And the more you divide your tonnage—say ten or twenty torpedo vessels for one battleship—the greater the economical loss. This was the fatal economical error of Jefferson's seductive cheap gunboat policy, a measure which insured a minimum of military usefulness at a maximum of pecuniary outlay. In my opinion nothing has occurred so far in this present war to confirm the opinion that torpedo attacks by small vessels against battleships will be frequently successful. However, even as a matter of mere good luck, success at times must be expected; hence it is desirable so to regulate the size of the battleship that the loss of one may not be excessively felt. It will be impossible to contest control of the sea with vessels exempt by their draught from torpedo injury; and control of the sea is the one thing needful. For the most part, attack by torpedo vessels will be confined to coasts and the neighbourhood of ports, where they will generally be encountered, and in measure checked, by vessels of their own class."

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I think the House ought to be very grateful to my noble friend Lord Brassey, not only for his own interesting speech, but for the very instructive and important statement which he has elicited from the First Lord of the Admiralty. I feel that we have been a little remiss in not having given the noble Earl an opportunity of making a statement such as he has made to-night at an earlier period of the session. I am not prepared to deal with the noble Earl's statement beyond referring to a few points. I am aware how important it is that the Fleet should have ships to scout for it, but I think that torpedo-boat destroyers, while admirably suited for work in narrow channels, were not intended to accompany a great fleet to sea. With regard to the question of boilers, when I was at the head of the Admiralty my Board were responsible for introducing the water-tube boilers. They introduced the Belleville boilers; and, although that particular class of boiler may be too delicate and expensive, yet I am glad to see that the recent Report shows that the principle of water-tube boilers is a right one, and of great advantage to the Navy. Turning to the question of the two-Power standard, I entirely agree that we are not in the same position as other countries, but the noble Lord seems to consider that the enormous extent of our trade and the number of our colonies are the main factors which should regulate the standard.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: I said I believed these to be most important duties that the Admiralty had to consider which foreign countries had not to consider.

EARL SPENCER: I agree, but I thought the noble Lord had dwelt too much on that aspect of the matter. What we have principally to consider is where our enemies' ships will be, and what ships they will have. I am not quite certain whether the two-Power standard is a good one to go by. No doubt circumstances have changed in the last twenty years, but I think such tremendous strides have been taken that we have almost exceeded what was right and necessary. It behoves the Government, and every Government, to be very careful not to exceed what is actually necessary. I should be very much against trying to build two kinds of battleships, and I think that what the First Lord has said on this subject is eminently right. Besides the size, speed, and armament of battleships, a point of great importance for our consideration in the construction of battleships is coal endurance. In regard to naval works I feel some responsibility, inasmuch as when I presided over the Board of Admiralty naval works were commenced which since, I am afraid, have grown to a very great degree. But we found that the old-fashioned roads where ships of war used to assemble were absolutely dangerous in view of the possibility of modern torpedo attacks. I am unable to say whether the extension of naval works since that date has gone too far, but I do think that the time has come when some halt should be called in the enormous expenditure that is now taking place.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Third Reading (which stands appointed for this day) put off to Thursday next.

POST OFFICE BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order) and passed.

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES.

First Report of the Select Committee. Considered (according to order), and agreed to.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 188.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 9*th August*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; Leyton Urban District Council Bill; Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [Lords]; Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Lords Amendments to be considered upon Thursday (Evening sitting).

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow.

Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. To be considered To-morrow, and to be printed, [Bill 300.]

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. To be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Leeds University Bill; Electric Lighting (London) Bill, without Amendment.

Licensing Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill; Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Bridlington Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Buxton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Trafford Park Bill [Lords]; Stretford Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]; Belfast and North East Ireland Electricity and Power-Gas Bill [Lords]; Belfast Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to Regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland." [Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Glasgow Corporation (Sewage)." [Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill. That they have come to the following Resolution, viz.:—

That the Promoters of the Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon in order to proceed with the Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next Session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present Session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit after the next meeting of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto, signed by the Agent, stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present Session.

That the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to every stage through which the same shall have passed in the present Session, and that no new fees be charged in regard to such stages.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present Session; and desire the concurrence of this House in such Resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) moved that the Standing Orders relating to Private Business be amended as follows:—

In page 57, Standing Order 9, paragraph (2), line 2, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user.'

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (2), line 3, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 2, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 3, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 13, after the word "taken," to insert the words "or compulsorily used."

In Standing Order 9, paragraph (3), line 15, after the word "taking," to insert the words "or compulsory user."

In page 60, Standing Order 24, at end, after the word "Agriculture," to add the words "and Fisheries."

In page 61, Standing Order 26, line 4, to leave out the words "Fisheries and."

In page 61, Standing Order 26a, line 5, after the words "of the," to insert the words "Board of Agriculture and."

In page 61, Standing Order 26a, line 6, to leave out the words "and Harbour Department of the Board of Trade."

In page 62, Standing Order 30, at end, after the word "Agriculture," to add the words "and Fisheries."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, paragraph (4), line 2, to leave out the words "Fisheries and."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, paragraph (5), line 3, after the words "of the," to insert the words "Board of Agriculture and."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, paragraph (5), lines 3 and 4, to leave out the words "and Harbour Department of the Board of Trade."

In page 63, Standing Order 33, paragraph (7), line 7, to leave out the word "labouring," and to insert the word "working."

In page 64, Standing Order 33, paragraph (14), line 6 after the word "Agriculture," to insert the words "and Fisheries."

In page 64, Standing Order 33, paragraph (14), at end, after the word "Agriculture," to add the words "and Fisheries."

In page 65, to leave out Standing Order 38, and to insert new Standing Order 38—

38. Where any Bill contains or revives or extends power to take compulsorily or by agreement any land in any local area as defined for the purposes of this Order, and such taking involves, or may involve, the taking in that area of any house or houses occupied either wholly or partially by thirty or more persons of the working class, whether as tenants or lodgers, the promoters shall deposit in the Private Bill Office, and at the office of the central authority, on or before the 21st day of December, a statement giving the description and postal address of each of such houses, its number on the deposited plans, the parish in which it is situate, and the number (so far as can be ascertained) of persons of the working class residing

in it, and also a copy of so much of the deposited plans (if any) as relates thereto.

This Order shall not apply where a statement in pursuance of this Order was deposited in respect of the Act, the powers of which are proposed to be revived or extended.

For the purposes of this Order the expression "local area" means—

(1) as respects London the Administrative County of London.

(2) as respects England and Wales (outside London) any borough, or other urban district, and elsewhere than in a borough or other urban district, any parish.

(3) as respects Scotland, any district within the meaning of The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; and

(4) as respects Ireland, any urban district.

The expression "house" means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling.

The expression "working class" means mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons, other than domestic servants, whose income in any case does not exceed an average of thirty shillings a week and the families of any of such persons who may be residing with them.

The expression "central authority" means, as regards London, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and, as regards England and Wales, outside London, the Local Government Board, as regards Scotland, the Secretary for Scotland, and, as regards Ireland, the Local Government Board for Ireland.

The expression "Bill" includes a Bill confirming a Provisional Order.

In page 80, Standing Order 76, line 3, after the word "England," to insert the words "or in Ireland."

In Standing Order 76, line 4, after the word "oaths," to insert the word "and."

In Standing Order 76, to leave out from the word "and," in line 5, to end of Order.

In page 81, Standing Order 84, line 11, after the words "Agriculture," to insert the words "and Fisheries."

In page 86, Standing Order 128, line 7, after the word "Bills," to insert the words "originating in this House."

In page 87, to leave out Standing Order 133a, and insert new Standing Order 133a—

133a. Where any society or association sufficiently representing a trade, business, or interest in any district to which any Bill relates, petition against the Bill alleging that such trade, business, or interest will be injuriously affected by the provisions contained therein, it shall be competent to the Referees on Private Bills, if they think fit, to admit the petitioners to be heard on such allegations against the Bill or any part thereof.

In page 88, Standing Order 141, line 4, after the word "England," to insert the words "or in Ireland."

In Standing Order 141, line 5, after the word "Oaths," to insert the word "and."

In Standing Order 141, to leave out from the word "and," in line 6, to the end of the Order.

In page 99, Standing Order 184, line 2, after the word "land," to insert the words "in Scotland or Ireland."

In Standing Order 184, paragraph (1), to leave out from the second word "in," in line 2, to the second word "more," in line 3, and to insert the words "any house or."

In Standing Order 184, paragraph (1), line 4, after the word "by," to insert the words "thirty or more."

In Standing Order 184, paragraph (1), line 4, to leave out the word "labouring," and insert the word "working."

In page 100, Standing Order 184, to leave out from the words "the Committee," in line 15 of the page, to the word "Bill," in line 20.

In page 108, Standing Order 207, at end, add—

Provided that where any such Opposed Private Business is set down to be taken at the beginning of an Evening Sitting and is disposed of, any Motion contingent directly or otherwise thereon may with the assent of the Chair be considered and disposed of at the same sitting.

In page 119, insert new Standing Order 254a—

254a. Where, under the provisions of Section 9 of the Procedure Act, a Confirmation Bill has been referred to a Joint Committee, the Committee of this House shall consist of three members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER explained that the first batch of Amendments were purely formal, being necessitated by the transference of the Fisheries from the Board of Trade to the Agricultural Department. The proposed new Standing Order 38 was necessary for this reason. Last session, under the Housing of the Working Class Act, a new principle was adopted that, where land was taken compulsorily, the actual number of the working classes should be ascertained and provision made accordingly. It therefore became necessary to amend the Standing Order. The Amendment to Standing Order 76, to insert on page 80, after "England" the words "or in Ireland" was simply in order to enable affidavits which had to be sworn and produced before the examiners to be taken in Ireland in the same way as they were taken in England, namely, before a commissioner qualified to administer oaths. Under the Standing Order, as it stood at present, they had to be taken before assistant barristers, which office, he was told, had become obsolete. The next Amendment of some importance was 133a, "*Locus Standi* of Associations, etc." This went one step further than they had hitherto gone and would make it possible, subject to the assent of the Court of Referees, for any *bona-fide* associations, which it could be proved to the Court of Referees were likely to be injuriously affected by any Private Bill, to be heard. This had really been forced upon the Court of Referees by reason of cases that had come before them from time to time where associations wished to be heard, but could not be heard. Then the last Order but one on the Paper related to the arrangement of private business. At present any Instruction upon an opposed Private Bill could not be taken at the same evening's sitting, but this Amendment would make it possible to do so. It would not put private Members in any better position.

Objection being taken by Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) to an Amendment to Standing Order 33, consideration of the Motion was postponed till Thursday at the evening sitting.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Bethnal Green, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SANDGATE HOMES (PAUPER INMATES CHARGEABLE TO METROPOLITAN UNIONS).

Return [presented 8th August] to be printed. [No. 323.]

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd August; *The Lord Advocate*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 324.]

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894 (ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd August; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 325.]

INSPECTION OF MEAT.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th July; *Mr. Field*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 326.]

CLERGY (WEST INDIES).

Copy presented, of Return of the Amount payable on 5th January, 1904, out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical purposes in the West Indies [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION.

Copy presented, of Appendix to the Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 5, 1904).

Copy presented, of Accession of China to the Convention signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, dated 29th June, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3250 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL STATISTICS.

Copy presented, of Statistical Tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates. Part XXVII. for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (COLONIES).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the several British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates in each year from 1889 to 1903, Forty-first Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL IMPORT DUTIES, 1904.

Copy presented, of Return relating to the Rates of Import Duties levied upon the principal and other Articles imported into the British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates for the year 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAINING COLLEGES (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "for the years 1902–3 and 1903–4, respectively, giving (1) the names of the Training Colleges in Ireland, whether under the management of the National Board or under local management, on behalf of which application was made to the Commissioners of National Education within the last three years to sanction an increase in the number of King's Scholars which each such College was authorised to admit to training; (2) the number of King's Scholars in each such case which each such College was authorised to admit at the time of the above application; (3) the increased number of King's Scholars asked to be authorised for admission in each case; (4) the decisions of the Commissioners of National Education in each case, giving, if the decision was favourable, the increase authorised in each case (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 288, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

CASUALTIES TO SHIPS.

Return ordered, "of Casualties to Ships, showing the date, the name and class of the Ship damaged, the nature of the accident, the number of persons injured, the number of deaths (if any), the result of any inquiry that may have been held into the circumstances, and time in dockyard for repairs, during the year ending the 31st day of December, 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 317, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Management of Cells at Police Stations—Suggested Inquiry.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the conditions connected with the management of cells at police stations; and whether he will consider the desirability of instituting, at an early date, an inquiry into this subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) My attention has not been specially called to this subject. Upon the information at present before me I have no reason to suppose that an inquiry such as the hon. Member has suggested to me is necessary; but if he is in possession of any evidence tending to show that there is need for an inquiry I shall be happy to consider it.

Denbighshire Burial Dispute.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the refusal on the 20th May by the Rector of Clocaenog, Denbighshire, of the parish bier for the interment of the late Mr. John Hughes, a parishioner, under The Burial Law (Amendment) Act, 1880; whether he is aware that difficulties under such circumstances frequently occur with regard to the use of the parish bier; and whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any legislation on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have made the inquiries which I promised in this matter and have received a report of the facts. I can, however, only say that I have no authority to determine what is the law. or to intervene in the matter. However much such difficulties are to be regretted, I do not think that legislation is called for.

Audit of Local Authorities Accounts.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Departmental Committee to consider the audit of the accounts of local authorities has now been appointed; if so, whether it is preliminary or supplemental to or in substitution of the conference unanimously recommended by the Municipal Trading Committee; if preliminary or supplemental, at what date the conference will be convened; if in substitution, what are the reasons for disregarding the Report of the Committee; and what steps will be taken to give effect to its recommendation that it is desirable that the opinion of professional accountants should be obtained as to the best means of prescribing and auditing the accounts of local authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The object of the Departmental Committee will be to deal with the question raised in paragraph 9 of the Report of the Joint Committee on Municipal Trading as to the practicability of a standard form of accounts for local authorities being prescribed. I have not at present been able to appoint the members of the Departmental Committee, but I contemplate that in connection with it the opinion of professional accountants will be obtained. I am only concerned with the accounts of local authorities in England and Wales, and I think that by the adoption of the course which I propose I shall obtain expert evidence of the kind referred to in the Question, and also other evidence which it is desirable I should have to enable me to decide as to the form of accounts to be kept.

Rails and Engineering Plant ordered by London County Council from British and Foreign Firms.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the value of the orders for rails and engineering plant respectively, placed by the London County Council with British and foreign firms respectively, for each of the last three years.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am not in possession of the particulars asked for, but I have communicated with the County Council on the subject. I am informed that there is no complete Return from which the information desired could be readily given. I am promised, however, that it shall be collected and sent to me as soon as it can be obtained. On its receipt, I will communicate with my hon. friend.

Housing Acts—Concentration of Administration

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he can now state what progress has been made during the last three months to concentrate, in accordance with the Housing Act of 1903, the administration of the Housing Acts in the Local Government Board; and whether the administration of those Acts is still distributed between various Departments; and, if so, will he explain why no steps have been taken to carry out the transfer, which he has stated he is willing should be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) A portion of the administration of the Housing of the Working Classes Acts is vested in the Secretary of State, and has not at present been transferred to the Local Government Board. As I have previously stated, I am quite willing that the transfer should be made, but it has been desired that there should be some transfer of work from the Local Government Board to the Home Office in exchange. This is difficult to arrange, but the matter has not been lost sight of.

Explosions caused by Leakage of Electric Current and Escaped Gas.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, during the two years ending the 30th June last, the Metropolitan Police reported twenty-one explosions resulting in injury to eleven persons, and the death of two horses caused through leakage in an electric wire coming into contact with escaped gas; will he state how many of these explosions occurred in the streets of the Metropolis in connection with telegraph and telephone plant; and to what extent the persons injured have been compensated.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I have seen the reply of my right hon. friend the Home Secretary of the 28th ultimo,† giving the number of accidents mentioned by the hon. Member, but I am quite unable to admit that any of them could have been caused by the leakage of electricity from telegraph or telephone wires. There have been several explosions of gas in the street boxes belonging to the Post Office, but in none of these has it appeared that the Department was liable to pay compensation. I may add that some of the recent cases are under investigation, with a view to ascertain the true cause of the explosions.

Promotion of Assistant Postmen at Glasgow.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.) To ask the Postmaster-General, if his attention has been directed to the position of assistant postmen at present employed at Glasgow; and, if so, will he say what steps does he propose taking with a view to accelerating the advancement of these men with over four years service to the establishment.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am aware that there are several assistant postmen at Glasgow with more that four years service. As vacancies occur on the established force of postmen they are nominated to one-half of the vacancies, the other half going to ex-soldiers and ex-sailors. I may add that during the past year about 80 appointments have been made to the class of town postmen, of which about 40 have been filled from the class of assistant postmen. I will make inquiry as to whether it is possible to accelerate the advancement to the established class of the assistant postmen of long service.

Seventh Hour Daily Attendance—Extension of Leave of Postal Officials.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will explain why, when the seventh hour daily attendance was imposed on the Civil Service under the Order in Council of August, 1890, the additional annual leave permitted under that Order to Civil servants in receipt of more than £350 a year was not extended to the Post Office as well as to other Departments of the Civil Service.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am not aware that any additional annual leave was granted under the Order in Council of August, 1890, as compensation for additional daily attendance. The arrangements in the Post Office as regards leave differ from those in force in most of the public Departments; and I do not consider that it is advisable to make any alteration in them.

Ventilation and Cleaning of Belfast Sorting Office.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can say when it is proposed to provide the additional ventilation in the Belfast sorting office sanctioned a considerable time ago; and will proper steps be taken to have the printed regulations regarding dusting and cleaning strictly observed in the sorting office.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I understand that a contract for the work has been made, and that it will be begun in a few days. The dusting and cleaning of the office are, I am assured, properly attended to.

Superannuation of Mr. Murray, of Post Office Savings Bank Department.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a clerk named Murray, recently employed at the Savings Bank Department, London, has been placed on pension on the ground of ill-health, notwithstanding the fact that the specialist who examined him asserted that his ill-health was only temporary; and whether he will state the reason for superannuating a young officer of good conduct and service.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxviii., 1444.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am aware that a clerk named Murray formerely employed at the Savings Bank Department has recently been pensioned on the ground of ill-health. Mr. Murray subsequently appealed for reinstatement in the service and submitted a medical certificate in support of his appeal. Since then he has been examined by the Chief Medical Officer of my Department who reported that it would not be advisable to give him a further trial at present, but that the matter might be further considered in twelve months time. The case will accordingly be reviewed at the expiration of that period.

Foundation Managers of Carnarvonshire National Schools.

MR. GEORGE KENYON (Denbigh Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will say, as the result of inquiries made under the supervision of the Board, what variations have been sanctioned in the case of six national schools in the county of Carnarvon as to the proportion of foundation managers: whether, seeing that these schools have been generally recognised as Church schools for many years, and are in union by their trust deeds with the National Society, he will state on what grounds the variations are being sanctioned; and whether a like process is to be applied to non-provided schools in other counties.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The hon. Member is under a misapprehension as to the character of these schools. One of them is not in union with any denomination or society. In several, Church of England teaching has not been given for more than a quarter of a century; and in all of them the principles upon which the education given in the school has been conducted in the past were such as, in accordance with Section 11 (4) of the Act, the Board were bound to take into account in making orders for the appointment of foundation managers. As a result the Board have broadened the method of appointment of certain of the foundation managers, and in certain cases the requirement that a manager should be a member of the Church of England has been withdrawn. It is clearly impossible for me to say beforehand whether Section 11 (4) will apply to any cases which may arise in the future. Each case must be considered on its merits when it arises, and, if necessary, after a local public inquiry.

Value of Imports of Manufactured and partly Manufactured Articles.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, can he state or give a Return stating for the years 1902 and 1903 respectively the total value of imports into the United Kingdom of manufactured articles, and the total value of imports into the United Kingdom of partly-manufactured articles.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, can he explain why the table on page 5 of the Fiscal Blue-book, Cd. 1761, of 1903, which is declared on page 3 to be a continuation of the classification of Paper No. 102, of 1885 (in continuation of Paper No. 362, of 1882) fails to separate, as Paper No. 102 separates, the imports of manufactured from the imports of partly-manufactured goods, and gives only the total of both together; and will he give as a Return a Paper in continuation of Paper No. 102, of 1885, separating the two in the same manner for the years 1884 to 1903 inclusive.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Memorandum referred to was intended to compare the growth of the foreign trade in manufactures of the United Kingdom and certain foreign countries. These foreign countries make no distinction in their trade accounts between "manufactured" and "partly-manufactured articles," both being included under the category "manufactures." Hence, for the purpose of the Memorandum, no separation of these classes was required in the case of the United Kingdom figures. The categories of manufactured articles in the official trade accounts of the United Kingdom have recently been carefully revised and improved, and it is not expedient that any fresh Return should follow precisely the old and imperfect classification used in the Return of 1885. A Memorandum, however, dealing with the whole subject of the statistics of our imports and exports of manufactured and partly manufactured articles, with comparative figures over a period of years, is being prepared for publication, and I trust that this will give my hon. friend the information he desires.

Prison Officials' Quarters.

MR. CLAUDE HAY To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what progress has been made in the building of additional quarters for the fifty officers at Dartmoor Convict Prison, as land is available upon which the necessary accommodation could be provided by the Government, in order to remove the difficulty that working men in Princetown now have in securing houses at rents within their means, in consequence of the competition for house room in the township by the prison staff for whom the Government have hitherto failed to provide quarters; and whether he will furnish a Return of the number of officers of each of His Majesty's prisons who are not provided with quarters by the Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) No progress has been made with the building of additional quarters at Dartmoor, as no funds for that purpose are available in the present financial year. When the Estimates for next year are being prepared the needs of Dartmoor, in this respect, shall be considered; but I must add a warning that there are other prisons which may have a stronger claim than Dartmoor, where the great majority of the officers are already provided with quarters. If my hon. friend moves for the Return he mentions I shall be prepared to give it.

Alleged Excessive Sentence on Native at Dibrugarh, Assam.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that Mr. Commissioner Clifford recently sentenced a native of India at Dibrugarh, Assam, to two years rigorous imprisonment and three months solitary confinement for being found drunk in a house into which he had trespassed; and will he order some inquiry with a view to a remission of part of the sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have no information regarding the case referred to in the Question. If the facts were as stated it was open to the accused to appeal to the Sessions or High Court, and the case might also have been represented to the Chief Commissioner and the Government of India. I have no reason to suppose that any of these authorities would have refused any relief that was proper in the circumstances, and I do not propose to order an inquiry.

Complaints against Royal Irish Constabulary.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will consider the expediency of issuing a notice that representations affecting the conduct or character of individual members of the Royal Irish Constabulary will only be considered by the Chief Secretary's Department if they have been made through the Constabulary Office, where they will be treated in all cases as public documents and be reported upon as such.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The step suggested by my right hon. and gallant friend is, I think, unnecessary. All uch representations are considered by the Inspector-General as head of the force. If, as sometimes happens, representations are made to the Chief Secretary's Department they are referred to the Inspector-General who treats them as public documents and reports npon them as such.

Military Finance—Recommendations of Public Accounts Committee and War Office Reconstitution Committee.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the criticism of the Committee of Public Accounts on the war expenditure of 1902–3; and whether, in view of the conditions exposed thereby, the recommendations of the War Office Reconstitution Committee with regard to military finance in peace time and in the field in time of war, set forth in Part II., Sections 2 and 3, of their Report, have been, or will be, adopted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) It is proposed to adopt in the main the recommendations of the War Office Reconstitution Committee regarding military finance in peace and war. As regards the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, I must point out that while it alludes to certain defects which it is hoped will be remedied by the changes proposed, many of the criticisms are not directed against the War Office.

Niger and Lake Chad Boundary Commission.

Mr. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what has been the cost of the Boundary Commission commanded by Captain Elliot in surveying the frontier line between the Niger and Lake Chad; and will he state briefly what the Commission has accomplished.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The complete accounts of the expenditure incurred on this Boundary Commission have not yet been received, but the total expenditure may be estimated at from £9,000 to £10,000. Lieutenant-Colonel Elliot, R.E., and the officers who assisted him have made a careful survey of the whole of the frontier, some 900 miles in length, no portion of which had been accurately mapped before; and have, in conjunction with the French members of the Joint Commission, determined the positions of a very large number of towns and villages in the regions traversed by them, which were previously unmarked on any map or which had been open to dispute.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Conveyance of Explosives on Passenger Steamers.

Mr. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is the custom of the Admiralty to ship high explosives in large quantities upon British passenger steamers; and whether, seeing that these steamers do not accept similar freight from private shippers, he will state under what sanction the Admiralty acts in contradiction to regulations which have been thought necessary for the safety of the travelling public.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): It is not unusual for the Admiralty to ship explosives upon British passenger steamers, as in view of the excellence of the manufacture, the special way in which they are packed, and the fact that they are always carried in specially constructed magazines, the fear of accident is most remote. It is not correct to say that these steamers do not accept explosives from private shippers for conveyance, and the Admiralty are not aware of any such regulations as those referred to.

Niger and Lake Chad Boundary Commission.

Mr. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary ot State for Foreign Affairs what has been the cost of the Boundary Commission commanded by Captain Elliot in surveying the frontier line between the Niger and Lake Chad; and will he state briefly what the Commission has accomplished.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): The complete accounts of the expenditure incurred on this Boundary Commission have not yet been received, but the total expenditure may be estimated at from £9,000 to £10,000. Lieutenant-Colonel Elliot, R.E., and the officers who assisted him have made a careful survey of the whole of the frontier, some 900 miles in length, no portion of which had been accurately mapped before; and have, in conjunction with the French members of the Joint Commission, determined the positions of a very large number of towns and villages in the regions traversed by them, which were previously unmarked on any map, or which had been open to dispute.

British Indians in South Africa.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the negotiations carried on by him with Lord Milner regarding the general treatment of British Indian subjects in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony have been concluded; whether he has arrived at any settlement of the question as repeatedly promised by him; and, if so, will he state the particulars regarding it.

MR. LYTTELTON: The dispatch addressed to Lord Milner and fully setting forth the views briefly summarised in my speech of 21st July will reach him shortly. Obviously a final settlement cannot be announced till I have considered his reply.

Indian Finance—Indian Troops lent for Imperial Purposes.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state approximately to what extent the finances of India will be relieved during the current year through the loan of Indian troops for Imperial services outside India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Government of India have informed me that the saving to Indian revenues in the current year through the absence of Indian troops lent for Imperial purposes will be approximately as follows:—

Troops in China (savings calculated to end of year) £48,200. Troops in Somaliland (savings calculated to 30th Sept.) £42,800. Total—£91,000,

Indians in Japan.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether one of His Majesty's Indian subjects has been requested to return from Japan to India; and, if so, will he state under what circumstances.

MR. BRODRICK: I have no knowledge of the case to which the hon. Member's Question refers.

Indian Aristocracy and the Imperial Cadet Corps.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state how many members of the Indian aristocracy are at present receiving military education in the Imperial Cadet Corps recently founded by the Viceroy; and how many commissions as British officers it is proposed to confer annually.

MR. BRODRICK: The number of members of the Indian aristocracy receiving military education in the Imperial Cadet Corps is, according to the latest information available, twenty-two. So far as I am at present aware, it is not proposed to confer any fixed number of commissions annually on members of the corps.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): What is the definition of an Indian aristocrat?

[No Answer was returned.]

Egyptian Finance.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the accumulated funds and annual revenue now and hereafter to be placed at the disposal of the Egyptian Government, by virtue of the Anglo-French Agreement, will he state the financial programme that the British advisers to the Egyptian Government propose to recommend.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The hon. Member will find in the Blue-book, Egypt, No. 2 (1904) which has just been laid before Parliament a despatch from Lord Cromer dated the 22nd of April last describing the financial programme which he recommends.

Tung-ting Lake.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can say whether the German Government is endeavouring to acquire from the Chinese Government a lease of the Tung-ting Lake, in the Yang-tse Valley, for the purpose of naval manœuvres; and can he make any further statement on the subject.

EARL PERCY: No Sir. We understand that there is no truth in the report referred to.

Wei-hai-wei.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state whether any negotiations have taken place between His Majesty's Government and the Chinese Government with a view to a modification of the terms upon which Wei-hai-wei is held; and, if so, will he state whether His Majesty's Government proposes to retain Wei-hai-wei by purchase or otherwise in case the present lease should determine.

EARL PERCY: The Answer to the first Question is in the negative. I can make no statement as to the policy of His Majesty's Government in hypothetical circumstances.

Dutch Colonial Authorities and Mr. John Godden.

SIR ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any reply has been received to the representations made to the Government of the Netherlands respecting the wrongs inflicted by the Dutch Colonial authorities upon a British subject, Mr. John Godden.

EARL PERCY: Sir, I regret that we have not yet received a reply, but the Government of the Netherlands have assured us that the question is receiving their careful consideration.

SIR ERNEST FLOWER: Does the noble Lord expect a reply at an early date?

EARL PERCY: I hope so, but our last representation to the Netherlands Government was only addressed to it a fortnight ago.

The Postmaster-General's Report.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, having regard to the fact that the Postmaster-General's Report has for several years past been issued after the rising of the House, will he take such steps as may be necessary to secure the issue of the Report during the session.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I am not aware that the Postmaster-General's Report has for several years past been issued after the rising of the House. My Report for the past financial year has now been laid upon the Table of the House and I have every hope that it will be ready for distribution before the close of the present session.

Examination of Stock of Stamps, etc., of Post Office Counter Clerks in London.

MR. DAVID MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that counter clerks in London are entrusted with certain stock, stamps, and postal orders, for which they are held responsible, and that the stock is periodically checked by officials from the Controlling Office, who open the safe and cupboards frequently in the absence of the men affected, he will direct that the clerk with whom the property is entrusted shall always be present when the accounting takes place.

LORD STANLEY: The examination of the whole of the stocks of stamps, postal orders, cash in hand, etc., at each office, has to be made at one time as the separate sub-stocks form part of a whole balance. So far as is possible the examination of the sub-stocks are made in the presence of the officer holding the sub-stock, but when owing to his not being on duty this cannot be done, the officer's interests are safeguarded by the examination being made in the presence of one of his colleagues, who witnesses the counting of the money, stamps, etc., and the replacing of the stock in the safe under lock and key.

Duties on Publicans' Licences.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the disparity in the scale of Excise duties on publicans' licences, the smaller houses paying at the rate of 50 per cent. of their annual value; and whether he can now give an estimate of the addition to the revenue which would be effected by imposing on all houses a uniform duty equal to 50 per cent. of their annual value.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): I am aware of the disparity referred to by the hon. Member but it must not be supposed that the volume of business is always in proportion to the annual value of the premises. It is roughly estimated that the total annual value of public-houses (exclusive of hotels) in England and Wales is about £7,000,000. If 50 per cent. of this sum were taken as licence duty, it would amount to £3,500,000.

Agricultural Depression.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he can state how many acres of agricultural land have gone out of cultivation in England and Wales since 1874; and whether he can state the total rateable value of rural districts in England and Wales in 1873 and 1903 respectively.

*MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey.): A comparison of the Agricultural Returns of England and Wales for 1874 and 1903 shows in the latter year a decrease of 2,683,639 acres of land under the plough and an increase of 3,448,321 acres under permanent pasture. With regard to the second part of the Question, I am informed by my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board that the total rateable value of the rural sanitary districts in England and Wales for the year 1873–74, as shown in No. 3 Abstract of the Local Taxation Returns for that year, was £53,191,434; and according to the statements annexed to the reports of the union assessment committees, the rateable value of the rural sanitary districts at Ladyday, 1903, was £52,565,185. In connection with the decrease in the rateable value it must be remembered that the total area under the jurisdiction of the rural sanitary authorities has been much reduced in the interval by the formation and extension of urban districts.

Houses of Parliament—Members' Post Office.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if, during the coming Parliamentary vacation, he will arrange for the enlargement of the Members' Lobby Post Office; and, also, will have a series of pigeon-holes, one for each Member, placed in sight of the windows in such a position that Members may, without asking an attendant, see if there are any letters or documents in his pigeon-hole, and thus save the trouble of the attendants looking over bundles of unsorted Papers while the Member waits.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The question of further accommodation for the Members' Lobby Post Office has been often considered, but no enlargement is practicable, and there is absolutely no space for a range of 670 pigeon-holes. Some relief might be possible if hon. Members would use the Central Lobby Post Office for a greater portion of their telegraphic business; the accommodation there has recently been much improved.

Kingston Estate Evicted Tenants.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether application for reinstatement to their holdings have been received by the Estates Commissioners from Mr. Thomas Kent and Mrs. O'Brien, evicted tenants on the Kingston Estate; and whether, before the Estates Commissioners sanction the sale of this estate to the occupying tenants, an inquiry will be made into the circumstances of Mr. Thomas Kent and Mrs. O'Brien's cases, with the view of their reinstatement to their holdings on this estate.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Applications have been received from these evicted tenants, but so far the estate has not been brought before the Commissioners to be dealt with.

Irish National School Teachers.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.:) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the circumstances under which the Commissioners of National Education resolved not to recognise any newly-organised school, the teacher of which may have received dismissal by late manager; and what steps does he propose taking to prevent dismissal of teachers whose conduct is good and whose services have proved satisfactory.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners have not adopted the course suggested in the first part of the Question. Under the terms of Rule 44 (d) the local manager is the person charged with the appointment and removal of a teacher, and so long as the Rules are complied with the Commissioners do not interfere with him in the matter.

Mitchelstown Rent Appeal.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a recent hearing before Mr. Justice FitzGerald, the rent of the holding of Mr. Patrick Ahern, Ballylough, Mitchelstown, which had been fixed at £44 15s. by the Sub-Commission, was raised to £47 2s. 6d.; and if he will state whether any fresh evidence as to value was given before the Court, if the holding was inspected, and by whom.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Land Commission Court decides judicially in each case after hearing the evidence of the parties, upon consideration of the report of the valuers, and of all the circumstances of the case, holding and district. I cannot further discuss the decisions of the Judicial Commissioners.

Belfast Sorter's Wage Grievance.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state under what circumstances the wages of a sorter named Stevenson in the Belfast office were stopped on the 28th of last month, the date on which he met with a bathing accident; if he can say whether it is customary in the Post Office for officials meeting with accidents of such a character to be dismissed from the service from the date of such an accident; and does the dismissal of Stevenson relieve the medical officer of any further responsibility for his medical treatment, and to what extent; and did this consideration count when the report leading to dismissal was prepared.

Lord STANLEY: I am making inquiry on the subject of the hon. Member's Question and will inform him of the result.

Belfast Post Office—Cloak-room Accommodation.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that the battery room is just vacated in the Belfast office, he will arrange for it to be converted into a cloak-room for the use of sorting clerks and telegraphists on the postal side of the establishment, thus leaving the smaller room presently in use as a cloak-room for the supervising staff, for whom he has already undertaken to provide cloak-room accommodation.

Lord STANLEY: The subject of the hon. Member's Question is under inquiry and I will communicate the result to him as soon as possible.

Belfast Boy Sorter's Illness.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can explain why a boy sorter, named Wilson, in Belfast office, suffering from acute nervous prostration, was severely cautioned for leaving his lodgings in Belfast and going to his home in the country, by the instructions of two qualified medical practitioners whom he consulted; is he aware that the medical officer at Belfast, in reporting this case, informed the postmaster that the practice of officials taken ill in town and going to their homes in the country should be stopped; and, if so, will he take steps to provide the necessary attendance of youths who may be taken ill and who are debarred from going to their homes; and will he direct the record against Wilson to be cancelled.

Lord STANLEY: I am making inquiry on the subject of the hon. Member's Question and will inform him of the result.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked as to the business to be taken after the close of Supply and especially as to Order No. 11, the Education (Local Authority Default) Bill; also when the Licensing Bill might be expected from the Lords?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I cannot quite state when the Lords Amendments to the Licensing Bill will be taken. I am informed that they are not of a far-reaching character. After Supply to-night I propose to take, as the first order, the Welsh Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, and the Cunard Agreement (Money) Bill, the Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill, the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, and the Isle of Man Customs Bill.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Why not take the Shops Hours Bill?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I should be glad to take it, but it is better as a rule to get rid of the contentious Bills first.

Mr. BLAKE (Longford, S.): Is it the intention of the Government to take the Irish Land Bill to-night?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. The Irish Land Bill will not be taken to-night.

LICENSING BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 298.]

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 299.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).

Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 327.]

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Rufus Daniel Isaacs, esquire, K.C., for the Borough of Reading.

SUPPLY [22nd Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

Class IV.

I. £1,550, to complete the sum for National Gallery, etc., Scotland.

Sir J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) said he desired to call attention to the Report of the Committee appointed by the Scotch Office to investigate the administration of the National Art and Portrait Galleries at Edinburgh. He thought Scotch Members would do well to inquire into a matter of so much importance to Scotchmen, and he protested against the Scotch Estimates having been relegated to so late a date in a session so barren of Scotch legislation. He knew there were many subjects in the Report of the Committee which required further inquiry before the recommendations could be realised, and he would confine himself to two or three points with which he thought they ought to at once deal and in regard to which there seemed no reason for delay. The matters which he felt might require further inquiry were at the same time urgent ones, and he hoped they were receiving attention. For instance, there was the question of a new National Gallery in Scotland. It was a question which could not be decided off-hand, but the right hon. Gentleman would do well to remember that the Scottish National Gallery was such that in no other Gallery in Europe was the light and space so poor. There were three points in the Report with which he thought the Secretary for Scotland should deal at once. The first was the constitution of the Board of Manufactures itself. The Board consisted, and always had consisted, of the most intelligent and public-spirited men they could find in Scotland; but as a Board it had been throughout its career of a most inefficient character, and the country had had to pay very dearly in consequence. He was glad to notice that in the Estimates there was a sum of £2,000 for the purchase of pictures, £1,000 for last year and £1,000 for the current year; but he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he was going to entrust this money to the uninformed Board of Manufactures. If he were, he had persuaded the present Chancellor of the Exchequer to do what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol refused to do, and he was practically going to throw the money away. The Board of Manufactures effected the purchase of their pictures in a way which would be a discredit to any private collector, in a way which was positively scandalous. The proposal was absurd, and he could not believe that the right hon. Gentleman contemplated such a thing. They ought to put their National Gallery at once upon a business footing, to put the curator upon a proper footing, and to make the body to which he was subject a reasonable instead of an unreasonable and incompetent body as at present. The Curators of the National Gallery and the National Portrait Gallery were at present grossly underpaid. The Curator of the National Gallery received £250. No one would contend for a moment that he should receive less than £500. And the Curator of the Portrait Gallery received £150, rising to £200. A competent person could not possibly be found under £400 a year, except under the same happy circumstances as the case of the present holder, of the Curator having a private income.

Then the third matter which he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to deal with was the question of the sum of £2,000 per year which Scotland received under the Act of Union, and which represented the loss which Scotland suffered through the equalisation of the Customs and Excise duties at the time of the Union. The money was the private property of Scotland, and it should not be used, as it was at present used and had been used for a great many years, for paying liabilities which really ought to be borne by the British taxpayer. This state of things could not have arisen had it not been for two things. Unfortunately, the money was put on the Votes in 1854, and this was a step that ought to have been retraced at once. It ought to be placed upon the Consolidation Fund, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would tell them that this would be done. If it were not, he would hear a great deal more about this £2,000. The second reason was that the Board of Manufactures seemed to have been oblivious of the fact that this was Scotch money, and had gradually allowed it to be absorbed for the payment of things which in England and Ireland were paid for by the taxpayer. They could not regret too much that they had shown this extraordinary blindness to their duties as trustees, but the only remedy was to put the Board upon a proper footing and make sure that such glarin gfaults should not recur. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to deal with these three matters at once, but he did not wish to be ungrateful and, therefore, he would call attention to what he had done for them. He had persuaded the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give them £2,000 this year for the purchase of pictures, and he was glad to see that the bargain made two years ago had been carried out, because this £2,000 was promised by the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for West Bristol in 1901, and if it had not appeared on the Estimates they would have been subjected to robbery. He recognised also, and he gave the right hon. Gentleman great credit for it, that a sum of £200 had been put upon the Estimates to enable the National Portrait Gallery to make a modest acquirement in the way of pictures to that collection; and also a new sum of £150 which would enable that building to be cleaned. The effect was that these sums, amounting to £350 a year, now on the Estimates had to be used in correcting a state of affairs which had been a most disgraceful scandal in Scotland. They had also to thank his right hon. friend for a special grant of £800 for the Museum of Antiquities, and he recognised that he had done a service for Scotland for which every Scotchman ought to be exceedingly grateful. He asked the Secretary for Scotland if he was prepared to deal with the three subjects which he had specially brought to his attention.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) said he was given an opportunity of being completely frank with the House, because he was quite certain the Scottish Members felt this was in no sense a Party question, and he was perfectly certain his hon. friend, or any hon. Members who would speak after him, had no wish to criticise the Government, but were merely anxious to be taken into confidence, and to be told what steps had been taken to deal with the very serious and solid recommendations made by the Committee. His hon. friend had frankly said that there were very large questions raised in the Report upon which he could not give judgment. He (Mr. Murray) hoped he should show before he sat down that he should go further than he had been asked to go. He had been asked three particular questions. The first was as to the constitution of the Board of Manufactures. The Report finished with certain recommendations, among other things advising that the constitution of this Board should be altered. He was rather sorry his hon. friend had thought it necessary to make a harsh attack upon the Board of Manufactures, for, after all, they had done their best according to their lights, and especially as it was a complete change of his former attitude, for two years ago, when the Board was attacked, he pointed out that they bought a picture for £5,000, and sold it for £6,000, so that, judged by the vulgar standard of money, they had not made a very bad bargain. In the Report the Board was attacked, not for its purchases, but for not sufficiently strenuously knocking, so to speak, at the door of the Treasury. The Board was inclined to wash its hands of the whole concern, and, as a matter of fact, some of the members did actually send in their resignations; but upon representations being made to them, they patriotically said that although the Report did them scant justice they were perfectly willing to continue in office, in order not to put the Executive into difficulty, until the new arrangements were made. He thought they ought to be given credit for that.

He considered the Chancellor of the Exchequer had met them very fairly in the matter. He had not only given £1,000 a year for the purchase of pictures, but he was making up a year of arrears. He did not think the hon. Member need have any fear with regard to this money being given to the Board of Manufactures, for the present Board would have no anxiety to spend the money in haste according to their own ideas; and he was perfectly certain that, if they could not spend, at least they could save and leave it for their successors. The reason he was not attempting during this session to proceed with the reconstitution of the Board of Manufactures was a very simple one. To his mind the question was inextricably bound up with the question of what they were going to do with the National Galleries and other buildings; and he wished at once to indicate that, if certain arrangements were eventually made, and there was no need for them to take any great time, he was almost persuaded that there would be no necessity for the Board at all. He did not see, if the recommendations of the Committee were carried out, why the National Gallery should not be carried on by a separate trustee as was done in other countries. After all, the reason of these people being there was an historic one. They were appointed for a perfectly different purpose. They were originally a Board of Manufactures; then they became a Fishery Board, and last of all they came to art. The reason he did not hastily reform this body was because he was not convinced that there was any necessity for it at all, and because he did not think it worth while in the period of transition to start a new scheme until he knew where he was in regard to the re-arrangements of the various institutions. As regarded the salaries of the curators, he was entirely with his hon. friend, but he did not feel it possible to deal with that subject this year, because the recommendation of the Committee was for increased salaries with, of course, increased duties, and it seemed to him that the question depended upon the eventual position the man was given, and that again depended upon the whole re-arrangement of the various institutions. His hon. friend must not think that because the salaries had not been increased this year, he did not entirely agree with the recommendation, but he thought it ought to be done as part of the re-arrangement of the general situation.

Then the third point was the question of the transfer of the £2,000 a year, Scotch money, from the Votes to the Consolidated Fund. This seemed to him really a question of arrangement, more or less, of accounts. He quite understood the recommendations of the Committee and saw that, if in future there were a continuance of this arrangement, the money might be lost sight of again in the future, as it undoubtedly had been in the past. But he did not look at it as a matter of immediate moment, although, as far as the principle was concerned, he agreed with his hon. friend. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer went into the arrangements that were to be made, it might be decided that it would be an advantage that they should have some of that £2,000 a year in the shape of an accumulated capital sum.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL: Meanwhile it is being used for a wrong purpose.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY could scarcely say that it was being used for the promotion of Scottish Art. It might be that there were charges which it at present met which ought to be met directly by the Imperial Exchequer, but that was a perfectly different thing. The Committee's Report said that, for instance, the maintenance of the various buildings ought to be drawn in the form of a Parliamentary grant. There he was with his hon. friend, and he did not think there would be any difficulty about it with the Treasury, but that was not exactly the same thing as saying that the £2,000 was being wrongly used.

He would now tell the Committee about what, after all, he looked upon as a mere interim arrangement with the Treasury for this year. The old Estimate was £3,440, including, of course, the £2,000. This year they had had what he called temporary grants, £800 for the Museum of Antiquities, £1,000 on account of the arrears for the purchase of pictures—permanently, of course, they would have £1,000 intended to go on year after year, £200 for the Portrait Gallery, and an additional £150, making a total of £6,550 as against £3,400, which was the old charge. So far as the Committee's Report had shown in its recommendations, they might really say they had settled the whole matter, with the exception of the salaries and the upkeep of the National Gallery. The salaries of the National Gallery the Committee thought ought to be met entirely out of a Parliamentary grant, and the upkeep it had put at £700; and the contributions to the salaries of the National Portrait Gallery ought to be put at £250. Therefore all the salaries, subject of course to what he had said about the salary advances not having been made, they had practically raised with the Treasury on the lines of the Report. He could not say that he had got his right hon. friend's consent yet, because he had not formally asked for it, but he did not think the demand which had been put forward by the Committee on the question of these items coming on the Votes just as the National Galleries of England and Ireland were put on the Votes as one which ought to be resisted. He thought the Treasury had met them fairly and had done everything that could be done at once. They said that so far as there were other claims they must be part of their big scheme.

Now he would come to what, after all, was at the botom of it all. What was going to be done as to the condition of affairs? The condition of affairs permitted of being very simply stated. There were three competitors for the space on The Mound at Edinburgh: the National Gallery, the Royal Academy, and the Royal Institution and kindred societies; there was only room for two. The Committee pointed out that at present there was not room in the one wing devoted to the National Gallery for a proper show of the pictures they had got, though the hon. Member had perhaps a little exaggerated the extreme difficulties one had to undergo to see the pictures. At any rate, however, there was neither room for the proper exhibition of the pictures nor was there room for expansion. Of course, the simplest plan would be to turn out the other wing and give that to the National Gallery; but then where was the Royal Institution to go? This was not the recommendation which the Committee favoured. They said that even if the National Gallery had the whole of the two wings, it would be no more than enough for their present needs, and would give absolutely no margin for expansion, because both buildings were absolutely incapable of extension. If they kept the National Gallery in the Royal Institution they had the advantage that they had a very fine building in a very fine position, but, on the other hand, there was absolutely no capacity for expansion, and they also turned out the Royal Institution, which, although it had no legal title to the rooms, had certainly a great claim to recognition, because it had been there all along, and it was represented by a great many influential people who would certainly very much object to having to go. The question naturally arose as to where they would put the National Gallery if they did not have it on The Mound. Now, in Edinburgh it was not an easy thing to get a site; but there was one which had been particularly pointed out and which had certainly created a great deal of discussion in art circles, and that was the Royal High School, situated on a plateau just beyond Edinburgh Gaol. It was a classical and beautiful building, which stood on a plateau where there was a good deal of room for expansion, and it was a building which, being of one storey after the Greek model, could remarkably easily be adapted to the purposes of a picture gallery. He believed there was also room there for an art school, and he did not think it would be at all a bad thing to have the art school in juxtaposition to the National Gallery; and therefore he could not disguise from himself that this was a very attractive site. He was in this backed up by a letter from the president of the Royal Scotish Academy.

One more fact, and then the Committee would really be in possession of everything. He was met in the winter by a most influential deputation of really all the competent scientific authorities in Scotland, who urged strenuously and with great force that not only should the Royal Institution be allowed to remain where it was, but really that the building ought to be made the home of the learned societies. It was pointed out that it would be an immense advantage to them if they could have first of all a central hall where lectures and discussion could take place, and, secondly, that, if they could house the other bodies. they would have the combined libraries of the various scientific societies in one spot.

Mr. A. Graham Murray.

With these facts before him, he would tell the Committee frankly what he did. It seemed to him that it was impossible to make a real choice between the various schemes without knowing something about the pounds, shillings, and pence, therefore the first thing he did was to ask the Board of Works for a report as to how much money it would take to turn the Royal Institution into a picture gallery, and, having done it, how much more space they would get. He thought this was a practical inquiry to make. The outcome of that was this: The National Gallery at present had 8,600 square feet of hanging space and the Roval Scottish Academy had 8,700 square feet. Now, if the Royal Institution were transmogrified, it would provide 20,326 square feet, but this would not be first-class space, because, owing to the construction of the building, the lower side rooms would only have side lights. The cost would be comparatively small, and would amount to something like £3,000 or £4,000. They would, of course, have to find quarters for the Royal Institution somewhere else in a fairly central position. So far as he could he was making inquiries to find out what would be the cost of putting down a new Royal Institution in a central position in Edinburgh, and he was endeavouring to ascertain the whole total cost of the transmigration. Then he would be face to face with the difficulty that they would not have much more space than the Royal Academy and the National Gallery had between them at the present time. The effective space of the northern building was no more than the effective space of the other building, and there would be no room for extension. He had further instituted an inquiry to see if the authorities of the High School would, in any sense, be willing to treat. There was a controversy going on between the town council and the school board upon this matter. If, as a matter of national policy, the Royal Academy should go to the High School it would have to be done by a Bill. He was not so much inquiring with a view to see whether he was likely to meet with a willing seller as to be able to make a sort of pecuniary comparison between the two alternative schemes he had suggested. That was how the matter stood, and he thought it best to be perfectly frank with the Committee. He had not got a separate policy of his own, and he wished to make this statement because he wished to elicit Scotch opinion upon the subject. It was purely a question of £ s. d., and one scheme might turn out to be ruinously expensive as contrasted with the other, and this was a very good argument with the Treasury. He should not be at all surprised if some people were to be found of the opinion that the High School site was too far from the Academy. Some people would say that the High School had possibilities of expansion which the other site had not. He might say that personally he was rather enamoured of the High School proposal, but that was a point upon which he thought public opinion should have an opportunity of expressing itself. Looking to the recommendations of the Committee, and the fact that they had a certain amount of money in hand, and remembering that they had also got the possibility, at any moment, of getting capital in return for their annuity, he thought the pecuniary difficulties ought to be surmounted. It was certain that the present state of affairs ought not to be allowed to go on, and although there were obviously great difficulties in finally settling which course should be decided upon, he had indicated very plainly what the two alternatives were, and he hoped the Committee would agree that he had not been allowing the grass to grow under his feet, nor was he in any way anxious to adopt a policy representing his own personal view. He was anxious, as far as possible, to carry out the recommendations of the Committee.

The MASTER of ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian) pointed out that in the letter which had been quoted it was stated that under this arrangement Ireland received £34,000, whereas Scotland was only to receive £6,000. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would state what course of action he was likely to take?

Mr. URE (Linlithgowshire) said he had listened with great satisfaction to the statement of the Secretary for Scotland. What was proposed was nothing short of a revolutionary change in the management of the art galleries and art business in Scotland. It appeared to him that all the recommendations of the Departmental Committee, of which the hon. Baronet was a member, were very closely inter-related to one another and he observed that each recommendation concluded by stating that the Committee saw no reason why the change recommended should not at once be set about and that it brooked no delay. He thought the Secretary of Scotland had really gone as far as any practical administrator could go at the present stage in carrying out the recommendations of the Committee. He would briefly invite the attention of the Committee to the various recommendations in order that hon. Members might see clearly how far the Government were ready to go. The first and most vital recommendation was the reconstitution of the Board of Manufactures. That Board was really entrusted with the duty of encouraging art and supervising and managing all the institutions connected with art. He did not know whether the Secretary for Scotland intended to brush aside that recommendation or whether he proposed to set up a substitute for the Board of Manufactures equivalent to the body which managed the National Galleries in London and Dublin. It was quite obvious that some similar body would be required to be substituted. Why not accept the recommendations of the Departmental Committee and constitute another body at once so that the investigations which the right hon. Gentleman had been so assiduously and very properly making during the past few months might be handed over to this new body to which the hon. Baronet opposite would be prepared to entrust full powers of management. He understood that the Departmental Committee proposed that the new body should consist of fifteen members. The old body was too large, and there was no close and definite sense of responsibility, and no method or organisation about it, and those were the main complaints which had been made against it. It was proposed that of the fifteen members of the new body three should be members of the Royal Scottish Academy, two should be named by the Scottish Academy, one by the University, another by the County Council, one by the Royal Society, and another by the Society of Antiquaries. That seemed a suitable body to undertake the inquiry. It was necessary to appoint at once a curator with a proper salary and allowance for travelling expenses. It was indispensable that this new official should have the initiative, and, what was perhaps more important, that his decisions and advice should not be overruled by the board which it was proposed to set up. If they did differ from the decisions of this official they should record their reasons in writing. The Secretary for Scotland said he found great difficulty in setting up this new official until he had made up his mind whether there was to be a board of control. Did the right hon. Gentleman propose to constitute a new board? He thought that that step was absolutely essential.

The next most important recommendation of the Departmental Committee was the severance of the school of art altogether from the Board of Manufactures. It was proposed to set up an entirely independent board to supervise the school of art, and he was proud to think that the model of the new system was to be found in Glasgow. Another important recommendation was that adequate funds should be given to the National Gallery. He rejoiced to hear the right hon. Gentleman say that he accepted without qualification the recommendation of the Committee that the new gallery should be placed on exactly the same footing as the National Galleries in England and Ireland, and that they should have in Scotland a National Gallery as fully equipped and as well-supported by the State. They approached the subject of he National Portrait Gallery with a real sense of shame, because it had been treated in a most penurious and niggardly fashion by successive Governments. It had often been said that the lack of private munificence had contributed to the poverty of the national collections in Scotland. For that there was no foundation; but he thought the pernicious treatment of successive Governments tended to dry up the springs of private munificence. The National Portrait Gallery practically owed its origin to the princely munificence of patriotic citizens. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see that this difficulty was remedied. It was sad to read that in the National Portrait Gallery the staff was inadequate, the pictures could not be kept in good order, the ventilation was bad, and the ordinary repairs could not be properly carried out; and also that it was impossible to keep the building reasonably clean. He was glad to hear that it was not going to remain in that state any longer. He understood that the different sums voted for art purposes amounted to £3,150. He had been looking at the total net cost which the Committee estimated would be incurred if all their recommendations were carried out, and he learned that £4,200 would, in their judgment, suffice to carry out their recommendations. It was proposed that £2,900 should be given to the National Gallery, £600 to the National Portrait Gallery, because an increased salary to the curator was needed, £200 for additional pictures, and £400 to the Society of Antiquaries. The right hon. Gentleman had probably gone as far as it was possible for him to go in carrying out those recommendations. He hoped that in the meantime he would be generous in regard to salaries, and maintenance, and the upkeep of the buildings.

He agreed that the difficulty of choosing a new site was extreme, and nobody who knew Edinburgh would doubt that for a moment. He did not think that a third site was available and he wished the right hon. Gentleman well in his negotiations for the acquisition of the Royal High School. He was not quite certain whether he was going to place the National Gallery in the Royal High School. The Committee had pointed out that the present premises were quite inadequate in size for a permanent collection which they all anticipated would grow in extent every year. He understood that the recommendation was to leave the Royal Scottish Academy in possession of the buildings on The Mound, if suitable accommodation could be found for the pictures elsewhere. The Scottish Academy had gone as far as they could expect it to go in generously offering their pictures, which were valued at £38,000, as a gift to the nation in consideration of their remaining in the exclusive occupation of The Mound premises. That was an exceedingly good arrangement which, he understood, the right hon. Gentleman was willing to endorse. This discussion had been useful, if only for the fact that it had elicited from the Secretary for Scotland the very valuable and extremely satisfactory explanation he had given to the Committee.

*MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire) said he was very pleased to hear the statement of the Secretary for Scotland that he had practically secured, as far as the annual grant was concerned, all that the Committee had recommended, and very little remained to be added to make it complete. He was sure they would all be ready to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the success of his efforts with the Treasury. He desired to impress upon the Secretary for Scotland the necessity of providing liberal grants in connection with the new building for the National Gallery. Two years ago it was pointed out that while the London art galleries were receiving £80,000 a year, and the Dublin art galleries £8,760 a year, the Scottish galleries were receiving practically nothing. There had also been a large grant to Ireland for pictures when Scotland had received practically nothing in that respect. The Chancellor of the Exchequer two years ago intervened in the debate and rated the Scottish nation roundly for their parsimony in connection with art, pointing out that, in accordance with an agreement with the Treasury in 1886, contributions were given in proportion to the amount of the private donations to the picture galleries of the different countries. The right hon. Gentleman stated then that while Ireland had got pictures by private munificence to the extent of £60,000, Scotland had really done nothing, though a very much wealthier and stronger nation. He was glad that the Report of the Committee had corroborated what the Scottish Members said at the time to the effect that the liberality of Scotland, both municipal and private, had been very much in excess of that of any other part of the Kingdom. His hon. and learned friend opposite had referred to the splendid donation given by Mr. Finlay, of Aberdour, to the value of £60,000. The municipality of Edinburgh had not been behind in that respect, because it gave for £1,000 a site for the galleries which was worth £30,000. That was practically a gift of £29,000. He was informed that the city of Glasgow, through private and municipal sources, had in the last twenty or thirty years given no less than £750,000 for art purposes. That was probably the most munificent subscription to art in the United Kingdom or in Europe. He could state on the authority of Sir Francis Powell, the celebrated artist, that the Glasgow art galleries were the finest in the country, and perhaps in Europe. Reference had been made by his hon. and learned friend to the Glasgow School of Art. He would say that the Edinburgh school could take no better model than that of Glasgow, either in connection with buildings or the manner in which classes were conducted. He wished to impress on the Treasury the necessity of contributing liberally to the very large fund which would undoubtedly be required for the purpose of putting on a proper footing the new building for the National Art Gallery. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would be as successful with the Exchequer in his efforts to obtain a large capital sum as he had been in securing an annual grant for the purposes of art in Scotland.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said the Secretary for Scotland had stated that he was glad this opportunity had occurred for eliciting Scottish opinion, but surely an earlier time than the end of the session would have given hon. Members a better opportunity for that purpose, for the attendance of Scottish Members to-day was very small. He was sure every Scottish Member would have been present if the debate had taken place a month ago. He desired to acknowledge the interest which the Secretary for Scotland had shown in the question, and the careful analysis he had given the Committee of the various elements and of the different proposals. He earnestly hoped the right hon. Gentleman would continue to show this interest by pressing for more money. He was rather struck by the Report of the Committee in that respect. The Committee recommended an additional grant of £4,200. It was a remarkable Committee. It consisted of the hon. Baronet the Member for the College Division of Glasgow, the hon. Member for East Perthshire, and two other Members who were there to see that Scotland did not get too much. One of these Members was the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary. He was a Scotchman and he was also a member of the Cabinet, whose desires he might be taken as representing in matters of economy. The fact of his signing the Report and giving his countenance to the recommendation for an increased grant was of peculiar interest. The Director of the National Gallery of Ireland was also a member of the Committee. They knew that there was always competition between what was called the sister countries, and the case was very much strengthened by the fact that the representative of the only competitor in this matter with Scotland had assented to the demands made upon the Government. He was quite sure that these demands were reasonable, and he thought his hon. friend the Member for the College Division was justified in saying that every possible precaution should be taken to prevent the sum of £2,000 which was exclusively Scottish property from being either used to meet any charge which ought properly to fall on the National Treasury, or from being dealt with in a way which might make it possible that its character as Scottish property should be taken away.

The Secretary for Scotland promised to give them legislation at an early date. He quite saw that the right hon. Gentleman must have the assent of the Treasury, because a grant of money was a vital element in any proposal he might make. He hoped they might take it that the right hon. Gentleman would not allow the grass to grow under his feet, that he would obtain this grant as soon as possible, and that he would be able to bring in a Bill next session which would deal with the proposals of the Committee and reconstitute this so-called Board of Manufactures upon a new and better footing. Its present composition was rather absurd, and a very much better one might be found. Here he must make a remark in the interest of those parts of the country not immediately around Edinburgh Castle. The people of Edinburgh were apt to mistake themselves for the people of Scotland. There were people who considered themselves entitled to be represented in such matters as well as the people of Edinburgh. If the recommendations of the Committee were given effect to, it would be possible for the Secretary for Scotland out of the nominees assigned to him to make provision for counties and towns besides the capital. He noticed that the Departmental Committee suggested that a member should be appointed by Edinburgh Town Council, another by Edinburgh University, and that others should be represented by societies. The societies did, to a certain extent, represent Scotland outside of Edinburgh, but the University and town council members would represent the city of Edinburgh only. Therefore, he would say to the Secretary for Scotland, that if he was going to constitute the Board on a really proper national basis, he must have regard to the people outside of Edinburgh. By not making it too much of an Edinburgh board and by putting it on a wider basis, it would carry the confidence of the rest of Scotland.

On the question of site, he said that experience had shown, especially in the case of the learned societies of London, the immense benefit of endeavouring to consolidate the different societies in one local building. It would be a very great advantage if the Secretary for Scotland would endeavour to secure that the different learned and scientific societies of Edinburgh should be housed in, or near, the same spot. Any site chosen for art galleries should be one which would admit of the expansion of the galleries. It would be the greatest possible mistake to put the building in a place where that could not be done. The right hon. Gentleman carried the Committee with him when he indicated a site on Calton Hill. He was not certain but that the Secretary for Scotland might find it wise on the site question to have a Committee which would aid him, and which would take a little more evidence and report on the subject. No one could fail to feel the great importance of the question. Scotland had produced an unusually large number of eminent artists in proportion to the population, and it had shown a faculty for giving and maintaining a national quality in art production, and giving diversity and individuality to the subjects treated. If anything could be done to give it the means of maintaining that individuality which it had shown in the past, and which was more threatened under modern conditions than it was a hundred years ago, it would be a benefit not only to Scotland, but to the artists of the United Kingdom. Art should not run in one channel, but into a variety of types, and so enable the country the better to hold its place in competition with the other nations of the world.

There was one other point. It was a matter of the greatest importance to maintain the Museum of Antiquities and the National Portrait Gallery with a view to enable students and visitors from other countries to study the history of Scotland. There were very few countries whose history had so great an interest to travellers from Europe and America—partly through the dramatic events in the annals of the nation, and partly through the writings of Sir Walter Scott. And, therefore, anything which was done for the preservation of the antiquities of Scotland, and for the display of its collection of art, was of exceptional value and of great interest not only to the inhabitants of these islands, but to students from elsewhere. These considerations might seem remote from the matters they were discussing, but, when properly looked at, they were cognate to the main question they desired to bring before the Committee—viz., that they should deal liberally with these local collections and put their administration on a proper footing.

Mr. WALLACE (Perth) said he agreed with other Members for Scotland that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland was a most satisfactory one. Indeed, there was a proposal of the right hon. Gentleman which he preferred to that of his hon. friend the hon. Baronet the Member for Glasgow. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the danger which existed that, as long as this £2,000 a year, which was Scottish property in connection with the Act of Union, was put on the Estimates year by year, it must be taken out of the Estimates; and the hon. Baronet suggested that it should be taken out of the Estimates and placed on the Consolidated Fund. He liked better the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, who realised that a time might come when a Saxon Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was ignorant of the history of the matter, might suppose that this was a grant made year by year from the Exchequer to Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that this fund of £2,000 should be commuted at once, and the amount safely carried across the border. He agreed with that, especially as there was an opportunity now of utilising the money in connection with the new National Gallery for Scotland. He was not going to discuss the question of the composition of the new board that was to take the place of the existing one, because until they knew what were to be the duties of the new board it would be ridiculous to discuss its composition in the future. As to the question of sites, everybody who knew Edinburgh acknowledged that there were only two practical sites—the Mound, or the present position of The Royal High School. He had a suggestion, although he knew it was useless to make it: viz., that the existing miserable buildings on Castle Hill should be pulled down and the site utilised for the new National Gallery. They would get rid, not of historical buildings, but of modern structures which were a disgrace to the site and the city.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Does the hon. Member mean the buildings on Castle Hill?

Mr. WALLACE: No; the modern barrack buildings on the Castle Rock. He did not propose to pull down anything that was historical. Nobody would suggest vandalism of that sort; but the barracks which in all their deformity and nakedness affronted the eye of every stranger who visited Edinburgh for the first time, and were a disgrace to the architectural art of Scotland. As to the two sites referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, he quite agreed that it was difficult to form any estimate of the expenditure that would be required. If other sites and other buildings were to be found for the other institutions the £4,000 suggested would fall into utter insignificance. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that no better site could be found, if it could be obtained, than that of the Royal High School, standing as it did where one could see it almost from the end of Princes Street.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the Calton Gaol intercepted that view. And what about the gas-works?

Mr. WALLACE said he understood the gas-works were to come down. One of the most essential necessities for improving that part of Edinburgh was the removal of the gas-works. They had no estimate of the cost of the Royal High School site, and were working in the dark, so far as money was concerned. Apart from the question of the money which could be extracted from an unwilling Treasury in England, he thought that either of the sites referred to by the right hon. Gentleman would be satisfactory. He congratulated the Secretary for Scotland on his statement.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said he desired to say that he was perfectly satisfied that all his colleagues for Ireland were quite ready to back up their Scotch friends in their ardent desire to have museums and art galleries put on a proper basis, because they felt that their own development of Irish art should be put on the same sound basis. Sir James Guthrie, referring to the Royal Hibernian Academy and the Irish National Gallery, said in the Report already referred to—

"My Council are given to understand that the cost of corresponding buildings in Dublin and London were, for the most part, met out of Treasury grants."

Now, as a matter of fact, the only extent to which the Royal Hibernian Academy had benefited from the Treasury was £300. It had never benefited to the extent of a single penny in the way of a building grant. The Royal Hibernian Academy was built out of purely private funds. It was right that the Scotch claims should be properly put forward on their own merits, but they should not make capital out of totally erroneous views as to what had been done for Irish institutions. Sir Thomas Drew, president of the Royal Hibernian Academy, referring to the endowments of Scottish art, said—

"As against this, *per contra*, the Academy of Ireland has never had buildings or endowments of any sort from the State, but an annual vote of £300, and the chief consideration for that was the maintenance of a free life school for the few artists, male and female, studying in Ireland. Towards its main obligation of bringing contemporary art to the Irish people, its balance from State aid, when last computed, was £116."

He would not go further into the figures, but undoubtedly the Irish people had contributed a great deal towards the support of art in Ireland; and they were thoroughly with the Scotch people in their endeavours to put Scotch art on a proper basis. He hoped that next year the Scotch Members would support the Irish Members in their desire to have a thorough inquiry into the working of the national institutions in Dublin.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said he felt that the subject brought up that day would go on for years. It was not likely to be determined next year, or the year after, or the year after that. He quite agreed that the £2,000 referred to should be kept entirely distinct from Imperial money. There were two sums of £30,000 and £40,000 which came under the Treaty of Union. The first referred to the equivalent for the English National Debt and the second referred to the Scottish Universities. It had always been cast up at Scottish Members that that was Imperial money given to Scotland, whereas it was only one portion of purely Scottish money—reserved to Scotland under the Treaty of Union. The money should be utilised every year for the purpose for which it was granted. He did not understand why one generation should possess itself of the money. If that were allowed, the tendency of every generation would be to appropriate the money for its own purposes. With regard to the site for the National Gallery, he quite appreciated what had been said about the Royal High School at Edinburgh as a suitable site; but why should Edinburgh necessarily be chosen. In the past Edinburgh was the capital of Scotland; but why should they look at the site of the National Gallery from the point of view of sentiment. The gallery would be ten times more useful in Glasgow, where an enormous population had grown up in modern times. Edinburgh could keep its present buildings; but if a National Gallery was about to be established, Glasgow, with its population of over 1,000,000, would be more convenient. As regarded local aid, it would be forthcoming more readily if the gallery were situated in Glasgow rather than in Edinburgh. He quite appreciated the labours of the Committee; but the Report of a Departmental Committee took many years to carry out. Scotsmen would wish to see the more immediate matters put on the Imperial Estimates; but any further changes might well be left to the future.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he hoped that the Secretary for Scotland would arrange for the proper expenditure of this money; and that it would be expended for exclusively Scottish purposes. He wished to draw attention to the fees which were charged. In no other art gallery in the world were such high fees charged. The charges were mean and contemptible, and should be got rid of. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would be able to obtain the authority of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to dispense with these charges. The picture galleries on the Continent, including the galleries at Florence and Pisa, were free from anything of the kind. £34,000 per annum was given to the Art Gallery in Ireland; whereas only £6,000 was given to Scotland. The Secretary for Scotland should discuss that matter with the Chancellor of the Exchequer; because Scotland was surely entitled to as much as Ireland. It was very desirable to encourage art in Scotland; and he hoped that the Secretary for Scotland would succeed in obtaining from the Chancellor of the Exchequer a sufficient sum for that purpose.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL said he wished to thank his right hon. friend for his statement. It was a most satisfactory statement, and showed that the matters at issue were perfectly safe in his right hon. friend's hands. He hoped that in anything he had said he did not display any distrust in his right hon. friend. His right hon. friend chaffed him for having defended art purchases a few years ago; but he did not defend the Board of Manufactures from the then Chancellor of the Exchequer. Inquiries since then had convinced him that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was on that occasion perfectly right in every charge he brought against the Board of Manufactures.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he did not quarrel with the tone of the debate. He assured his hon. friend he was not at all apprehensive of want of confidence on his part. All he was doing was trying to defend a body of gentlemen whom he was sure had done their best in the circumstances in which they were placed. He could not pass without protest the attack of the hon. Member for Mid. Lanarkshire on the existence of the National Gallery in Edinburgh. Where did he want it—was it at Motherwell? Did he want the £2,000 divided among the parishes in Scotland according to their valuation and population. After all, the hon. Member must really give some place to Edinburgh, as the capital, and he would be a very poor Scot if he gave the hon. Gentleman the slightest hope of allowing the National Gallery of Scotland to be anywhere but in the capital. As to the reconstitution of the Board, he could do nothing without legislation. His point was that he hoped an arrangement would be made with the Treasury for the upkeep of these institutions. He could not abolish the Board as it was, because it was the only means at present by which the statutory funds could be distributed. The hon. Member for Perth had said the real figures were not given. He quite agreed. He did not think one could be in a position to give figures barring this, that if one knew what the work of the future was to be one could arrive at what would be the necessary solution. He pointed out that on the other alternative scheme they would have to find a new site for the societies which inhabited the Royal Institution, and that would be a very expensive process. Of course, as they were not quite so large, it would not be so expensive as housing the National Gallery elsewhere. He was bound to say, knowing Edinburgh as he did, he should despair of ever being able to solve this question by voluntary bargain at all. Therefore, what he wanted was the support of the House in one or other of the policies he had indicated, so that they might go forward with what might be the policy of the House.

Vote agreed to.

CLASS II.

£9,598 to complete the sum for the Local Government Board for Scotland.

MR. WEIR said this was not the first nor the second time he had had to draw the attention of the Committee to the necessity of the Local Government Board for Scotland taking more steps with regard to the number of uncertified deaths in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. This was not a matter of legislation, but of administration. These deaths were due to the insufficiency of medical men, and the Local Government Board should take steps to provide more medical men. He remembered once being in the Island of Lewis with a medical friend, when the minister was suddenly attacked by illness, and had it not fortunately happened that he was seen by his (Mr. Weir's) friend the minister would probably have died. This gentleman lived forty-five miles away from the nearest medical man, and had the gentleman been sent for in all probability it would have been found that he had been called to a patient miles away. It was a scandal to Scotland that such a thing should be allowed. He was sorry also to have to draw attention to the insanitary condition of the houses in the Island of Lewis; but having regard to the action of the the Government in dropping the Bill they proposed to bring in he had no alternative but to call attention to these matters. Four thousand houses at least in Lewis were in a most insanitary condition, the people inhabiting them only being separated from the domestic cattle by a handrail. Their condition was simply alarming. It was a state of things that ought not to be allowed in any part of the British Islands. He had been in many lands, and seen many peoples, but he had never seen anything so bad as the conditions which existed in the Island of Lewis. It was a scandal that should not be allowed to continue. The Local Government Board should appoint a sufficient number of inspectors who should be sent out to report what alterations should be made and should not be allowed to waste their time in Edinburgh. This condition of things existed on the western mainland. What was the result? Epidemics constantly raged, and there were no isolation hospitals for the patients, who had to be treated in their own homes. The result was that 135 schools were closed from two to four weeks twice or three times a year. That was a most serious thing from the point of view of the education of the children. No wonder the people were never able to get on. The schools themselves were not in a satisfactory condition; the water supply was bad; and the ventilation was bad, and when he asked the local sanitary inspectors and the local medical officers for health why they did not report these things they replied that they were tired of sending reports to headquarters because the Local Government Board took no notice. Why was not this state of affairs remedied? It would not be allowed for a moment if these places were close to our great cities instead of being remote.

Another matter in regard to which the Local Government Board had been guilty of serious neglect concerned the condition of the churchyards in many parts of the Highlands. For years the sanitary inspectors had been calling attention to the facts, but nothing had been done. In many cases the churchyards were so crowded that the bodies were almost out of the ground. The Local Government Board ought to insist upon more land being secured, and he urged the right hon. Gentleman to see that the officials at Edinburgh performed their duties in a more satisfactory manner. During the past year no fewer than nineteen medical officers had been appointed, not one of whom possessed a public health diploma. That was in direct contravention of the statute. What was the good of passing Acts of Parliament if the Secretary for Scotland paid no attention whatever to them? Then there was the question of tuberculosis. That was a terribly infectious disease, the spread of which the Local Government Board ought to do its utmost to prevent. In many new establishments special wards were being set apart, and he suggested that if alterations were not being made in existing institutions they ought to be. The least that should be done was to provide a kind of out-house in which such cases might be isolated. He also asked what the Board were doing in the way of securing the medical examination of children, with a view to providing, where necessary, better treatment and nourishment, as recommended by the Physical Training Committee. Thousands of men were rejected annually for service in the Army and Navy because of their physical condition not being up to standard. He hoped the Board would do their utmost to bring this matter prominently forward.

The recent Return with regard to local medical officers was of the most inaccurate description. The Board ought really to see that the information they furnished to the House was correct, instead of doing their work in so slip-shod a manner. Another matter to which he had had to refer on previous occasions was the use of humanised lymph. It was condemned in every other civilised country, and yet it was allowed in Scotland. Vaccination was compulsory; there were no exemption certificates in Scotland; therefore, it was the duty of the Government to see that the lymph supplied was of the very best quality. The lymph was supplied in Scotland by an official of the Local Government Board on his own account, and none of the vaccine stations were subject to proper supervision. Any vile stuff might be sent to them. How were they to know that it was all right? There was no standard of quality for the lymph. If the Government insisted on compulsory vaccination they ought to see that there was a sufficient supply of the purest and best quality that could be obtained. He was not surprised that the people of Leicester should stand out against the abominable practice of vaccination. If they could be assured that the lymph was pure and up to a proper standard many people who claimed exemption now would not do so. He admired those who resisted rather than submit to brutal and arbitrary laws. He asked the Secretary for Scotland to give attention to the vaccination question and to see that the Local Government Board made arrangements for a satisfactory supply of lymph. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give some assurance that he would waken up the Local Government Board from their slumbers, because the matters to which he had referred, and others with which he would not deal at present, ought to be better attended to than they had been in the past.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton) said he was a member of the Local Government Board for some time, but he was afraid that would not recommend it much to the hon. Member for Ross-shire. His experience as a member of the Board had enabled him to appreciate the points which the hon. Member had raised, and the difficulties which the Board, both as a board and as individual members, had in meeting those cases. He could assure the hon. Member that they quite recognised, and especially in the northern districts, that there were many geographical and local circumstances which made the condition of the population by no means easy. So far as matters of public health were concerned the conditions were sometimes of such a character as to give a great deal of anxiety to those charged with the care of the interests of the people. If the hon. Member would pardon him for saying so, the Highland districts of Scotland, at any rate, were well represented on the Local Government Board. The Secretary for Scotland was a member of the Board, and he and the other members were well acquainted with the conditions in the various districts of Scotland.

MR. WEIR: They never go there.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON said the hon. Member was hardly fair to the members of the Board. He knew that it was their fortune to visit different parts of the Highlands every year, and he could assure the hon. Member that the condition of the Highlands with regard to the various matters referred to were not only constantly brought before the Local Government Board, but that they engaged their most careful consideration. They were as anxious as any public body could be to ameliorate the condition of the population in the various districts. With regard to uncertified deaths in Highland parishes, he agreed that the number was unfortunately too large. But, on the other hand, he was afraid it was a matter in respect of which no power possessed, at any rate, by the Local Government Board could give any effectual remedy, for unless the patient had been seen by a medical man it was not easy to get a satisfactory certificate. He was sure the hon. Member recognised that the long distances in sparsely populated districts, and the fact that in such districts as were to be found in many of the Highland counties they could not get a sufficient supply of medical men, made it difficult, and indeed impossible, completely to remedy the evil which had been referred to. He could assure the hon. Member that nothing had been wanting on the part of the Local Government Board to see that a better state of matters was brought about in that respect. The insanitary state of the houses in many parts of the country was also a matter which all must regret, but here again, he was afraid that the Local Government Board had not power to enable them to satisfactorily deal with it. To a large extent it must remain a matter for the management and the administration of the local authorities in Scotland. He did not desire to blame them at all in that respect, for one recognised the difficulties of the situation. One result of taking action in this matter might be to deprive some of the country population of even the inadequate housing they at present had, because the cost was such that he doubted whether it could be obtained to an extent which would be sufficient to secure an adequate improvement with regard to the houses. He was in hopes that his right hon. friend the Secretary for Scotland might be able to follow the example of his predecessor, as the hon. Member desired, and that they would get the benefit of his further experience.

In regard to the position of the schools, that was a matter which had been engaging the attention of the Local Government Board and of the Scotch Education Department, and he was very hopeful that if they were fortunate in respect to educational legislation next session, that it would be put on a better footing. The condition of the churchyards was entirely a matter for the various local authorities. They had power to look after their condition, if there was such room for complaint as the hon. Member had suggested. He could assure the hon. Member that it was not at all an easy matter for the central authority to insist on the strictest regard for the law in these remote, sparsely populated districts, because that would involve expense beyond what these poor districts were able to bear. They could not have local administration carried out as satisfactorily in these sparsely populated and poor districts as in wealthier districts where the resources of civilisation were much more easily available and where a remedy was less expensive to get. As to the supply of medical officers of health, that was a matter for which the Local Government Board had over and over again endeavoured to find a remedy. But everyone who was acquainted with the difficulty of the question would realise that they could not get the best men to go to an out-lying district as officers of health where there was little or no private practice to give them anything like a remuneration for their ability or energy and induce them to settle down in that part of the country. During the last seven or eight years, he knew, the Local Government Board had had to meet that difficulty and they were endeavouring to meet it.

The last point referred to by the hon. Member was as to the supply of lymph. He thought that the conditions under which that supply could be procured were thoroughly well known to the hon. Member. He thought that the arrangements which had been made were really the best possible. The supply of lymph wanted in Scotland was not at all sufficient to demand the setting up of an independent establishment; and arrangements had been made with the English Local Government Board to get an adequate supply so as to avoid the use of humanised lymph. The hon. Member said that the use of humanised lymph was forbidden in England. He did not know whether that was so or not; but so far as the practice in Scotland was concerned, the use of humanised lymph was very small compared with that of glycerinated lymph. The administration of the vaccination laws in Scotland was even less grievous than in England. Although the law in Scotland was very strict, the Local Government Board recognised that it did not pay to make too many martyrs in that regard. Fortunately, the Scottish population were fully aware of the advantages of vaccination and re-vaccination and they did not have so many of that class of people who objected to vaccination as, say, in Leicester. So far as the administration of the Vaccination Laws in Scotland was concerned there was no substantial grievance in Scotland. The Local Government Board were anxious, by care and attention, to remedy the evils to which attention had been drawn by the hon. Member, and many of which he agreed existed, and to secure that the various local authorities should, so far as their means would allow, conform to the law. At the same time they recognised that the difficulties of the situation were such that it would lead to greater evil if the strict letter of the law were enforced. They must wait for the legislation which the hon. Member desired; and he could not doubt that, by the assistance of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark in an early session, they would be able to remove some of the difficulties in the way of the Local Government Board.

MR. WEIR said he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he would give all the assistance in his power to get such legislation passed.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he could only suggest that in the meantime the Local Government Board had to do their duty and that the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark should likewise do his.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he wished to compliment the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ross and Cromarty on the manner in which he had by speech and Question and Answer attempted to keep the Local Government Board up to their duty; and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would see in the future some further fruits of his efforts. He trusted that English Members would follow the example of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty in that regard; for, after all, public Departments were the better for criticism like that directed against them by his hon. friend below the Gangway. By so acting they would be doing good service to their constituencies and the whole country. The hon. Member had called attention to the number of medically uncertified deaths in Scotland. In Scotland there was some excuse why a number of deaths were not certified by a medical man on account of the great distances; but an alteration of the law might bring about a remedy of the evil of which the hon. Gentleman complained. It was not for the public well-being that any citizen should die without some proper investigation being made as the cause of death. Without that the perpetrators of crime escaped, who, under a more efficient system, would be discovered and brought to justice. It also involved a large amount of carelessness on the part of those connected with the persons who were suffering from disease. If, as the hon. Member suggested, pressure could be brought to bear on the Local Government Board, some alteration in the law might be secured. At the present moment it was a scandal in England, as well as in Scotland, that a large number of people were buried, the cause of whose death had not been properly certified. The law in this country should be made like that in any other civilised country where no person could die without proper investigation into the cause of his or her death by some one representing the Government. That was a question which he had repeatedly brought before the House, and there was little excuse for the Government not introducing legislation long before now. The Report of the Committee which investigated the subject and whch suggested a remedy had been before the Government for the last eight or nine years, and a draft Bill had even been prepared, but up to the present time no legislation had been introduced.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is asking for legislation on this subject. That cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

SIR WALTER FOSTER said he was only calling the attention of the Local Government Board of Scotland to this matter, and suggesting that some remedy might be found for the present unsatisfactory condition of things. He thanked his hon. friend below the Gangway for having raised this question. He thought the excuse which the Lord Advocate had given was a fair one in regard to distance. His hon. friend also referred to the question of the use of humanised lymph, and he was glad that the Lord Advocate had given a sympathetic answer. He hoped that the necessity for the use of humanised lymph would disappear altogether. It was within the duty of the Government to supply glycerinated lymph for the purpose of vaccination. He was glad that in Scotland they did not make martyrs in connection with vaccination. They had too much good sense. The people of England were often driven into opposition against vaccination because they were occasionally made martyrs in the cause. The administration of the Act would be efficient, and more satisfactory to the public if a proper supply of glycerinated calf lymph was at the service of all practitioners.

With reference to medical officers of health, there was a difficulty in many districts on account of the small areas, and the consequent small salaries. The remedy for that was co-operation between adjoining districts, which would enable salaries to be increased without any excessive burden on the rates. If the Local Government Board of Scotland would induce local authorities to co-operate in this manner, there would be generally a more efficient administration of the law. He hoped the same practice would be followed as was followed in England; and that every county area would have an officer of health. The question of expense should not be considered; because the saving of the lives of a few bread-winners would be equivalent to the salary of an officer of health for a year. It was the worst economy to attempt to save where health was concerned. It was stated that it was very difficult for a central authority to look after the sanitation of individual houses; but the duty of the central authority should be to keep the local authorities up to their duty in that respect. He thought that more might be done in that direction. At present the power of the local authorities or the central authority was not sufficient to enable them to house the people as civilised beings and members of a great Imperial race should be housed. The conditions of life in the Islands and Highlands of Scotland, and also in England, were not creditable; and it was only by steady and continuous pressure on the part of the central authority that the local authorities could be kept up to their duties in that respect. The local authorities were always thinking of expense; but expense did not enter into the question of keeping people in good health and enabling them to bring up their children properly. Money spent in that direction added more to the strength of the Empire than all the talk about Imperialism which had been heard in and out of that House. Nothing could more conduce to making the people of this country an Imperial race than by providing them with houses where morality and decency could be preserved. At present thousands of people lived in houses where morality was a miracle, and where decency was impossible. The Local Government Board for Scotland would be well advised to turn their attention to this matter; and he would urge on the Lord Advocate to use all the influence and the administrative powers he possessed in that direction.

Vote agreed to.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,615,509, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Working Expenses of the Post Office Telegraph Service."

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said he desired to say a word or two about the Report of the Post Office Wages Committee recently presented by the Departmental Committee appointed by the noble Lord's predecessor. The Postmaster-General was good enough to say that they should have an opportunity of discussing and hearing his views. It was not his fault that they had a comparatively short time that afternoon. More than a year had elapsed since the appointment of the Committee whose Report was spoken of by the then Postmaster-General as one which ought to be speedily made, and during a somewhat long period they had not had an opportunity of seeing its contents. At any rate, what they were entitled to hope now was that that afternoon the Postmaster-General would say distinctly whether he accepted the recommendations of that Report, and when he would be prepared to carry them out. Speaking generally, he ventured to say that after years of discussion the Report seemed to him to afford a solution of many controversial questions, and that, though it did not by any means completely answer the expectations, on points of detail, of those who, at any rate, gave evidence before the Committee, yet it was very well worthy of their consideration and also the consideration of the Committee, in the interests ultimately of the State itself. Now, he would remind the Committee that there had been a controversy on this question for something like twenty-one years, and during all that period they had continually stated that there was great discontent in the Post Office, not merely on the question of wages, but as to the conditions of Post Office labour. That statement had been constantly and officially denied, but in this Report it was stated that there had been widespread discontent. Upon this he would only offer this observatin. No service could be thoroughly effective and no Department could be worked economically, in the widest sense of the word, where wide discontent existed, and he hoped—this being alleged by the Committee after full consideration of the present condition of affairs—the Postmaster General would see his way to accept the recommendations of the Committee for the removal of that state of things. He would also say that during the period to which he had referred, when the staff considered the grievances which they had to bear were great, they had never failed to consider the paramount subject of public convenience. He remembered well, some ten years ago, when things were so acute as to threaten a strike, that they were induced —and on the whole with difficulty—to give preference to the public convenience, and subordinate their private interests, a subordination which, according to this Report, seemed to have made some demand upon their sense of reason and prudence. The contentions which had been made from time to time in this House were thoroughly vindicated by this Report and by the previous Reports. Even the Tweedmouth Report, unsatisfactory as it was, did recommend an increase of pay, and they might safely draw the deduction from those Reports that the staff were suffering, and had been subjected for a long period to an injustice, the remedy for which he hoped, in the interests of the State, was near at hand.

Now he should like to say a word upon the history of the Report. It came from a Committee which was not of the staff's seeking. They desired a Select Committee of that House; in other words, they left the judgment of their case to their own employers. The answer always made was political pressure would be applied, and, he supposed, political expectations would be discounted; and that a Committee of that House was not the proper tribunal to try their case. It had, at any rate, the great merit that the staff from the first said they would abide by the final decisions of the Committee, both as to pay and conditions, and he ventured to say that a Committee of that House would not be subject to those suggestions made against it. He believed they would have done justice, and they would have had the certainty of the acceptation of their decisions, which he thought was an important point. Now the Committee ultimately appointed by the noble Lord's predecessor, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, was a Departmental one, and it was essentially a Committee of employers; no members of the service were placed upon it. No Labour Members were added to it, as some of them then desired. It consisted of Sir Edward Bradford, Mr. Charles Booth, the eminent statistician and social authority, and such commercial men, dealing with large numbers of employees, as the Manager of Harrod's Stores, and the Manager of the Great Central Railway. It was a tribunal which had this advantage, that it was obviously open to it to compare wages and conditions of employment generally with the wages and conditions of the Post Office service. Then much had been heard in that House of the great advantages of the Post Office service in medical aid, pensions, and the like; but he drew attention to the fact that this Committee swept away those considerations, and pointed out that if advantages were given they were balanced by some disadvantages of the public service. He pointed out that the order of reference was a restricted one, dealing simply with the question of the remuneration of labour, and, he ventured to say, of course with the advantage of knowing now what the decision had been, that few men could be found so qualified by their wide knowledge than the Committee appointed.

The present Chancellor of the Exchequer ceased to be the Postmaster-General soon after the appointment of the Committee, and the Committee very properly submitted to the noble Lord the question whether, under the changed circumstances, they should proceed with their work. What the noble Lord replied was that he practically took the same view as his predecessor, and so he bound himself, of course with the latitude which attached to the acceptance or otherwise of all Reports of Committees, to at any rate a favourable construction and consideration, and he hoped also to a generous and liberal interpretation of the Report which might be presented. The consequence was that, if there was not confidence in the ultimate decision, there was a strong hope that it would be a decision that would be accepted. The staff gave evidence and the hearing was practically in public, the Press being represented, and throughout the whole proceedings there was no restriction on the conduct of the inquiry. And if the staff had an opportunity of giving evidence so equally had the Comptroller and the officials of the Post Office, in the presence, he believed, of the secretary of the Post Office, and the Committee might take it that the whole aspect of this wage question was laid before this tribunal of business men and therefore the Report was one which commanded confidence, and was one which he hoped would be accepted.

The Report indicated the position taken up on behalf of the staff. In dealing with the Report, he wished to emphasise that there were points touching whole classes and individuals which were not accepted. In some cases he believed some classes of men would even be sufferers by the change recommended, but, taken on the whole, he thought it afforded a basis of settlement. In dealing with the various classes of the staff, he believed he might state that the sorters generally regarded the Report favourably and the postmen took the same view, though there were points of detail to which exception was taken and upon which, after the noble Lord had stated his general view, it might be necessary to approach him. Taking the case of the postmen for instance, the Report recommended that the system of Christmas-boxes should cease, but whether the addition of pay which only commenced after the age of twenty-six, made any real compensation for this somewhat remunerative system, bad as it was, was a question on which there were various views. And in some other respects what was proposed to the postmen was of doubtful value. In one respect there was a strong indication of the case made on behalf of the men, and that was as to the London telegraphists, for whom a maximum of £190 had always been claimed. The Committee had always been met with the statement that no such inducement was promised as a maximum of £190 after many years service, but the men had alway considered there had been a breach of faith on the part of the Department. This was a strong term to use and it was one which he did not endorse, but the Report told them that the men had been under a misapprehension—that they entered the service under a misapprehension caused by the publication of inducements on the part of the Civil Service Commissioners who conducted the examinations. For a series of years there were all sorts of barriers and obstacles to the attainment of this maximum of £190 in the shape of testimonial examinations and the like; but when they found the Committee, after going into the question thoroughly, saying there was an inducement to men to enter the service in the prospect, to use the words of the original advertisement, of obtaining a maximum of £190, and that there was a grievance there, then he thought it was a wrong which if not legally reparable was entitled undoubtedly to equitable consideration. If they had a Report dealing concretely with each class of officers in £ s. d. down to a very low point of detail, and if such a Report by employers felt it was just and right that the wages scale should be revised, he thought it was a case of injustice, however unintentional, to the staff which called for redress, and he hoped the noble Lord would tell the Committee that these recommendations made upon such authority would receive all the weight to which they were entitled.

There was of course one point which he ought not to fail to deal with in this summary, and that was the question of cost. Of course to make these additions to salary would involve some cost, but the very fact that the Government had to make that addition was evidence of a previous injustice in an inadequate scale of pay; and they must remember that the Post Office was a commercial undertaking which annually paid to the State a very large profit; and surely the first claim upon that profit was that of those who had helped to earn it, and that they should be reasonably, fairly, and adequately remunerated. If the Government did not do that they were really imposing a tax upon a class for the benefit of the community and on a class among the poorest and in favour of the richest. Therefore he maintained that as long as they had a balance of profit in the Post Office they at least ought to discharge fairly the claims upon it in respect to the wages of those who enabled that profit to be realised, and if they failed to do that they really approved of a system of class taxation. Sweating in any form of industry was objectionable. Parsimony was not economy in the end. The Report spoke of requirements of capacity and character and of the very high range of duties performed by these men, and the Committee very properly said that they ought to be adequately remunerated in such circumstances. There was no economy in underpaid or ill-paid labour. When the Committee found that the duties performed by the staff were responsible and exacting and demanded both character and capacity, he thought there was an unanswerable case. It was time to redress a long-standing injustice which for nearly twenty years they had brought to the notice of the House. He could discuss the details, but this was neither the time nor the place to do so, but he thought he had indicated on the basis of this official Report some reasons why at last the time had come for the redress of grievances of too long standing.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said there was one thing which he should like to remark on and that was that this Report had been presented for nearly three months. What was the situation? It would be discussed in a hurry and then the Estimate would be closured without proper discussion. Having regard to the deep interest in the matter they should have had a full opportunity of expressing their opinion on it fairly.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I am not responsible for that. Supply is always put down at the request of the Opposition.

MR. LOUGH said he did not complain of the noble Lord but he was complaining of the Government generally. An arrangement ought to have been made by which the Votes could have been discussed freely. He wanted to criticise the action of the Post Office somewhat generally, but he did not desire to direct it too personally to the noble Lord, who had only been in office for a year or a year and a half. During his short experience they had had two Postmasters neither of whom had been entirely satisfactory, and who had left the House the constant burden of making these complaints, with which his hon. friend the Member for South Islington had dealt for so many years.

The position was a little peculiar. This Report with which they were dealing only referred to the remuneration of the employees of this great Department of State. He was strongly of opinion that such good relations should have been established long ago between the Post Office and its employees as would have prevented the constant necessity of the matter be discussed in that House. He did not think there was any other Department of the State in which complaints of the employees were so constantly being made. Within the last few years they had had two of these Committees. The first, the Tweedmouth Committee, was practically composed of Members of that House. They were told that it was a model Committee composed of all the virtues. Its recommendations were not acted on. If they had been, and the Postmaster-General had established better relations generally with the employees, at a round table for instance, Parliament and the country would have been saved many of these discussions. The Committee would remember the circumstances out of which this last Committee sprang. Members were constantly trying to deal, with the imperfect knowledge they possessed, with the complaints made by their constituents. It was always weariness for him to have to touch these matters at all, and it was only a sense of the real injustice contained in the complaints made by the men which had induced him to devote so much time to the matter as he had done. The finger of scorn had been pointed at hon. Members for voicing these complaints but eventually the Department said, "Now we will appoint an immaculate Committee, one whose Report everyone will receive and welcome," and they set up their Committee of business men. There was no taint of Parliament about that Committee, its members had nothing to gain by courting public favour. What had they done? All the recommendations made in the past seemed to be a perfect joke compared with the Report of this Committee. It had found the Department guilty on all counts, especially in the matter of remuneration. It was in these circumstances that they desired to hear from the noble Lord what steps he proposed to take in the matter. No doubt expense might be involved. It was necessary that the matter should be treated by the Department in a broad way, because it was quite possible that by treating employees better an improved system of economy would be introduced into the Post Office. These people, after all, had important duties to perform, and while the increment of pay secured a good deal, he believed that on the whole the better treatment of the employees in this as in other businesses would be found to be the most economical policy.

One or two difficulties which the noble Lord would have to encounter might be mentioned. One was the restricted reference to the Committee. Various classes of workers were excluded from the inquiry. How would these men feel seeing that every class whose case was brought before the Committee was proved to be underpaid? Would it conduce to more contentment in the minds of those whose cases was not considered? There were the tracers, for instance. They had a constant grievance of a technical character against the Department. He thought the Committee would be justified in pressing the Department to receive these men in a sympathetic and conciliatory spirit and to hear what they had to say instead of forcing them to discuss their complaints with Members of Parliament. Another class whose case ought to be considered were the unestablished men. In his own constituency there was a large factory for the making of telephonic instruments, and he was told that hundreds of the men there employed, although they had served for periods of from two to ten years, were not established, and that amongst these unestablished men dismissals were constantly going on. Not only were they denied the general good treatment received by men on the establishment, but they had not the ordinary security enjoyed by men under any good employer. The request put forward by these men was extremely moderate, viz., that men continuously employed for two years and upwards should be placed on the establishment. If two years was too short let some other period be fixed, but the men ought to have some means of getting established. The Post Office ought not lightly to commence the manufacture of instruments or anything else, but if it did take it up it ought to set up fair and even generous conditions of labour. If the grievances only of the classes mentioned in the Report were dealt with the discontent would be widened. Then there was a class known as bagmen largely employed in London, and they made the simple request that they should be admitted to the advantages arising from the "stripes" system. Another class whose case was not considered was the porters, and they, too, had their grievance. It was not unreasonable to ask the noble Lord to make a statement with regard to these classes as well as those dealt with in the Report, because, if they were not dealt with, the seed of discontent would be sown, and they would have all the trouble over again.

The great complaint against both the Tweedmouth and the last Committee was the limited nature of the reference. As an illustration of the difficulties with which they were confronted he would mention one case which had come under his notice. There happened to be in Islington a man named Carless, who had asked him to put Questions in the House about his case and he had refused to do so, because he did not like to raise these matters in the House in that way. It appeared that some years ago this man was dismissed from the Post Office on a charge of theft, and he immediately met the charge in what appeared to be a reasonable way. This man contended that if he had committed any theft he ought to be prosecuted, and if it was proved that he had not committed any theft he ought not to have been dismissed. The man had been pressing that view upon the Post Office authorities for three and a half years and he could get no answer from them. The Post Office would not have been guilty of any unkindness if they had arrived at a definite conclusion satisfactory to the man and his friends in the one direction, or in the opposite direction, and yet for three and a half years the case of this individual was agitated and finally he had to come to Members of Parliament in order to bring pressure to bear upon the Department. He had seen articles quite a column long in the papers upon this case, and it was a pity that this matter should have been dismissed in this way, because he thought the Department could have dealt in a conclusive manner with the case. That was a good example of the conduct of the Post Office in these matters. Other employers did not find these difficulties, and they had no substantial grievances with any of their workmen. He did not think that with better management these difficulties would arise in the Post Office. With regard to Christmas-boxes he hoped the noble Lord would be very clear about that matter. He understood that the Committee recommended that a substantial increase should be given to the men in lieu of Christmas-boxes, but how were Christmas-boxes to be got rid of? In a report upon the Report which he had received from the men he gathered that the Christmas-boxes amounted to something like a quarter of a million of money, and it was said that this sum would be saved to the community in return for an increase in the wages. If the community had to find this extra large sum of money for wages he thought some definite step ought to be taken to put an end in some conclusive way to the Christmas-boxes, it was a question which ought not to be left open and loose. Altogether he thought that the Department must feel that this Report was a serious reflection on the management of this great branch of the public service. It was a pity that they had got to the point of referring matters of remuneration to those gentlemen, however excellent they might be; and now that they had given a Report, which was a condemnation of the Department after ten or fifteen years of mismanagement, he appealed to the noble Lord to exercise his influence with those able men who constituted his Department to induce them to endeavour to establish better relations in the public service over which they had the control.

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said he thought this Report established the fact that the conditions and pay of a large number of, if not of all these men was not only unsatisfactory but was, he believed, below the standard of a fair living wage. Whatever they thought of the gentlemen who formed this Committee, at least they gave an enormous amount of time and great care to the consideration of the problem. He felt that they owed a great debt to them for their trouble. It was a poor compliment, indeed, to them that the discussion of their Report should be relegated to the dog days, when Members were not in the best fettle and many were away. One thing he was sure would emerge from this discussion, that whatever Government was in power, this subject would not be allowed to rest until fair terms of pay and service were given to all branches of the postal service. He was also confident that both sides of the House would agree when he said that both Parties, when they had been in office, were equally to blame for the unfortunate condition of things. The hon. Member for South Islington referred to the contumely with which those who had taken up the cause of these public servants were treated, and allegations thrown at them as to their action on and interest in the subject having been inspired by the pressure of electors

So far as his experience of this matter went, he was able to assure friends of his who were not at all unwilling to throw that taunt at them, that those who had pressed for inquiry were pleased to be able to come down to the House and have the Report of the Bradford Commission in their hands, showing that the allegations they made as to the condition of these men were not unfounded, but were established in the Report.

The difficulty, no doubt, which must be overcome was that of cost. The noble Lord should not try to screen himself behind the question of cost. If he did, he would simply be parting from the rule which must be the guiding rule of every Department in the State—that of the model employer. If he continued the present system on the ground that the Post Office must not cost so much to the State, he would not only be parting from that very salutary principle but he would be bringing great discredit not only upon the whole Ministry but upon all who sat upon the Ministerial Benches. The other side had practically never done anything for the Post Office servants, although they had been many years in office. [OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear!"] Let him remind the House what the present Chancellor of the Exchequer laid down when he appointed this Committee. He urged very strongly upon the House that the main consideration which must weigh on him in the appointment of the Committee was that they should report quickly, and to use his own words, "that a speedy Report was most desirable." If that were so, he must have had in his mind the important consideration as to allowing this subject to drag on, and continue the feeling of unrest and uncertainty within the ranks of the Post Office service, which was most harmful to efficiency. On that ground, if on no other, it was much to be hoped that the Postmaster-General would not put off the decision of the Government on the whole subject till next year, but would boldly tell the Committee that evening that his Estimates for the coming year would make adequate provision for carrying out the recommendations of the Committee.

Mr. Claude Hay.

The Report established one principle which could not be too often made public. For something like six years they heard nothing from the authorities but assertions that the Tweedmouth Committee established finality. This Report had made short shrift of the Tweedmouth Committee, and that being so, he would remind his noble friend that if the Bradford Committee was to be used to establish finality he would not settle the unrest in the various branches of the Post Office, but would only reach complete satisfaction and efficiency when he had brought within the scope of consideration those various classes which had been excluded from the purview of the Bradford Committee. He should only like to refer to one detail of the Committee's Report. One of the paragraphs laid down that the test of population should practically be the basis for the purpose of fixing wages, and he thought that test was not a good one. The cost of inland towns and seaside resorts was often greater than in the large towns of the Kingdom. In illustration of that, he would quote the case of Princetown, Dartmoor, where the population practically was one which had been brought into existence by the contiguity of the Dartmoor penal establishment. The land of that neighbourhood was held by the Duchy of Cornwall, and the working classes were not able to obtain sufficient housing accommodation, and rents were forced up owing to the Government not providing sufficient housing accommodation for the Prison staff. The test of population, therefore, was not a fair one, and he sincerely trusted that his noble friend would bear that point in mind when he dealt with these recommendations. He was bound to say it was not encouraging, when great grievances were at stake, to find that after the great labour which had been expended by the Committee to which he had referred and the subject had been from time after time debated in that House, they should have to wait another year before the findings of the Committee were put into practical operation. But better late than never. If his noble friend was able to assure the Committee that these recommendations would become effective he would be not only the most popular Postmaster for many generations, but he would remove grievances which lay now upon more than 100,000 of their fellow-citizens who did their best for the country, and whose grievances were a stain upon the Government of the country.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said he could not imagine any service connected with the Government system which it was less desirable to associate with political Parties than the Post Office. The hon. Member for Hoxton had spoken under the impression apparently that the Post Office was a branch of the Primrose League or something of that kind.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY: I said that both sides of the House were equally to blame.

MR. BROADHURST said that the Post Office was a neutral institution in which they were all concerned, which they all defended, and which they all assisted to the best of their ability. He trusted they would hear no more remarks of the kind made by the hon. Member in this discussion. With respect to the merits of the question under discussion, eighteen months ago the then Postmaster-General instituted the procedure by Departmental Committee, by an independent Committee as it was called, in order that the Committee might arrive at an unbiassed conclusion and should not be influenced by votes for or against Members on the part of great postal establishments. That was the argument used at that time, but many of them thought that there ought to have been an inquiry by a Committee of Members of the House. They agreed largely with the then Postmaster-General that he should have his own way, however, on the understanding that the inquiry was going to be conducted in a business-like way and with great expedition. In their innocence they were misled by those fine phrases. They understood that if the Report of the Committee recommended any action, that action was to be taken almost immediately, and they were bound to notice the fact that although the matter was now eighteen months old the present Postmaster-General had not up to the present informed them what was in his mind. He would be glad if the noble Lord would tell them what action he intended to take. The verdict of the Committee, consisting of men not open to political influences, and acting under the Department's own reference, had gone against the Postmaster-General. What was he going to do in the face of that verdict? The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster-General was of a generous nature and always exceedingly straight in all his actions; and the Committee were expecting to hear from him that he intended to make this tardy act of justice. If the noble Lord satisfied them on this particular point he would get his salary covered, or was it his stipend?

LORD STANLEY: I have got it already.

MR. BROADHURST: At any rate the noble Lord would get his Vote without a division; but if he did not satisfy the Committee by adopting the recommendations of his own Committee then a division would have to be taken in order to emphasise their belief that the recommendations of the Committee should be acted upon at once. The recommendations of the Bradford Committee with regard to fixing wages according to population was an important point. He could not imagine anything more delusive. He lived in a humble township of less than 5,000 people, but he could live more cheaply in Manchester where house rent and taxes would be less, and where the choice of food was greater and the cost of food less. It was evident that the noble Lord fully appreciated that position.

LORD STANLEY: I appreciate the difficulty.

MR. BROADHURST: Now, in regard to the people who served the Post Office faithfully, but who were not necessarily in a position of independence, let him tell the noble Lord his own personal experience in this matter. The postman who delivered most of his letters was a telegraph boy whom he had known for years. Before that he was a caddie. Now he was a seasoned postman, a married man with children, and a more faithful servant the Post Office had not in their employ. He acted as postman for four or five months in a year, and at the end of that time was suspended until the next season. During the interval he had to find employment as best he could.

LORD STANLEY: The hon. Member, I think, is referring to Cromer, and refers to his postman being taken on during the summer season when he wants a caddie.

MR. BROADHURST said that that man had been, to the best of his knowledge, during the last twelve or fourteen years in the postal service; and he did think that if there was not full employment for a man, in cases of that sort, during the slack season, there ought to be some continuous connection between the Post Office and such a servant. That was an illustration of thousands of other cases. When they had such excellent servants in their employment they should be taken into consideration. They seemed to be in a perpetual ferment as regarded Post Office work. At one time the abominable and disgraceful sanitary arrangements of the post offices formed a prominent subject of inquiry, and many Members of the House did not press for reform some years ago in the Grand Committee because the Post Office promised to make a change. Why could not the Post Office follow the practice adopted by the cotton trade, the coal trade, and the iron trade, and have a standing Court of Appeal to which all complaints could be referred? It would save the Department a great deal of trouble and prevent discontent among the servants. If they were always in a state of agitation the Government would not get the best work out of them. The unrest amongst the working people showed that there was a wrong somewhere and that wrong should be rectified. He trusted when the noble Lord spoke that he would tell them what was proposed in these matters, and he would suggest most respectfully to the noble Lord that the sooner they heard him the better they would be pleased. He always liked to hear him, and to-night especially they were anxious and desirous to get light from the noble Lord who was the head of this great Department.

MR. RUTHERFORD (Lancashire, Darwen) said it was impossible to listen to this debate without feeling a great deal of sympathy with the noble Lord the Postmaster-General, because it was evident that to-night he was in a very awkward position. His position, however, had not been made by himself; it was inherited. It had been traditional to the office of the Postmaster-General to reply to all complaints for a quarter of a century back by saying that the men were contented and were well paid, and that nothing more could possibly be done. It was perfectly evident, on reading the Report of the Bradford Committee, that the replies that had been made from time to time to Members of the House by the Postmaster-General had not been well founded, and that grievances had existed. As a matter of fact, instead of this being a well conducted and contented service, all over the country there was a mass of seething discontent, widespread and not confined merely to the telegraphists or the postal department, but spreading over the whole of the different departments under the Postmaster-General.

He was not going into any particular details, because he did not think this a suitable occasion; but there was no doubt about it that the state of affairs with regard to the pay of the whole of the departments of the Post Office was practically this—that nothing had been done since 1890. Nothing whatever had been done since then and very little had been done since 1881, whilst at the same time the whole of the expenses of the men in the service had been rapidly increasing. Their cost of living, their cost of travelling to and from their work, their rent, rates and taxes had been rapidly rising, and that had not been taken into account in their pay. He would only give one illustration of the position of the men in the Postal Telegraph Department. It was this: that after twenty-three years of service a competent and efficient man in the Postal Telegraph Department got £3 a week in London and £2 18s. a week in the provinces, and when they looked at the question of promotion, they would find that 16 per cent. of the whole staff had obtained their maximum, and that, therefore, promotion was absolutely at an end so far as they were concerned. He thought it would be conceded that the public servants in this most important department had for many years been badly treated. Complaint after complaint had been made to Postmaster-General after Postmaster-General, and at last the noble Lord's predecessor said he would appoint what he called a Departmental Committee. The answer which had been given to Members of this House was, he ventured to think—he did not know if he was justified in using the word "insulting"—but it was exceedingly offensive. It was "Oh, you are interested because constituents of yours are urging these points and you want to get votes." So far as he was concerned he indignantly denied that. He did not believe there was a Member of that House who would pause to give consideration to any such paltry influence, because the number of votes in any given constituency was such a trifle. But the figures and the details with respect to the whole of these men had so impressed Member after Member that they had not been able to resist taking the matter up. The Postmaster-General had only one course to adopt that night. He ought to say he would at once adopt the Report of the Bradford Committee and he ought to come boldly forward and say he would apply the same principles and give the same advantages to those other departments of the service which had not been considered in that Report; but which ought to be taken into account and given equal consideration. The Postmaster-General, if he desired to retain that high opinion which the hon. Member opposite entertained of him, ought to take some such course.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) said that in the very few words that he should address to the Committee he did not propose to enter into the details of this Report, nor even into its general merits or demerits, for he held very strongly that this Committee was not fitted to consider the details relating to payment of the employees of the State. Even if there was no electoral influence concerned, the Committee as a Committee—a large body of this character—could not possibly go into the many details which must necessarily arise in a matter of this nature. But there was no question to anyone who was acquainted with practical politics that electoral influence did arise in these cases, and he would submit that these matters ought never to come before the House or the Committee of the Whole House for direct decision. The matter was sometimes worse than it was in the case of the Post Office. Dockyard and Arsenal constituencies occasionally, as they all knew, had elections in which votes were determined on questions relating mainly to conditions of employment. But it was impossible to leave the decision of these matters in the hands of a despotic Department, in the hands soley of the employers of the men concerned, nor could they lay down the rule that supply and demand must fix the rate of wages for the employees of the State. If that rule were adopted, they would have the rate of wages probably falling to an exceedingly low level, below a real living wage, down to the lowest level they could induce people to accept. Nor could they say that when these men entered the service of the State they knew the terms they were accepting, and ought, therefore, to be contented during the whole of their career in that service; for the cost of living was constantly rising, and the value of money was somewhat falling as years went on, and no one would suggest that what was a fair wage fifty years ago would be a fair wage now, or that a fair wage now would necessarily be a fair wage fifty, twenty, or ten years hence.

There must be some means of adjusting wages from time to time according to circumstances, and Parliament ought to establish some outside board or committee to act as arbitrator between the various Departments of the State and the bodies of men they employed, in cases of serious dispute. That was the course adopted in the great industries. Almost all the great industries had boards of conciliation with provision for reference to outside arbitrators in case of serious dispute. This Bradford Committee was precisely in the position of such an arbitrator; and he did not see how the Post Office could refuse to abide by its award. They were in the position of an employer of labour whose workpeople were discontented and the dispute had been laid before an outside arbitrator for his decision. That award had been given against the Post Office, and the Government could not well refuse to obey its verdict. Unquestionably the cost would be heavy, but it must be remembered that the Post Office was continually earning larger and larger profits. Ten years ago its profits were only £3,000,000, now they were £4,000,000. There had been an increase of 33 per cent. in ten years, which had been made from the labour of the people employed. If the men had been underpaid the increase of their salaries was surely the first charge on this increase of profits. Those on that side of the House might of course, and probably would, be taunted with the fact that at one moment they were advocating economy in national expenditure, and at another advocating an increase in specific items of expenditure; but they had never carried their desire for economy so far as to say that the State should pay its employees such a wage as in the opinion of an entirely impartial outside board of arbitrators was below the proper standard of remuneration. From the standpoint of the Treasury, the first outcome of the policy of appointing an outside Committee had not been very propitious, but he was convinced that along these lines the State ought to proceed, and that all questions of employment and of wages of State employees ought to be referred to some form of permanent Commission or Board established more or less on the lines of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) said although his remarks would be brief still he might say he had studied this question for a great number of years, and had been invited by large numbers of postmen to take part in deputations to the Postmaster-General. He had consulted Members of the Opposition on this question and thought the facts which he should place before the Committee would be such as to induce the Postmaster-General to take action in this case. The number of Post Office Officials exceeded the number of the British Army a few years ago. They numbered 176,000. They made claims which the Member for West Monmouth said presented an abyss that the country would never contemplate. He had on one occasion been invited to accompany a deputation to Mr. Arnold Morley. He asked how many Members of Parliament were going on the deputation and he was told, "There are thirty-nine and you make forty." Imagine forty Members of Parliament waiting on the Postmaster-General. Call it intimidation. He said it was not fair and the result was he stopped the deputation. He much regretted that his right hon. friend had already received a deputation of twenty Members of Parliament. The time had come when both sides of the House should resist the illicit demands of the postal service. He sympathised with the demands of public servants, but Sir George Murray proved conclusively that the postmen were paid better than the policemen, and showed by figures that they were indeed very well cared for, that they were paid on a scale of wages which no other person occupying their position now got, that they had doctors to attend them when they were ill and that they were partly clothed. The whole story told by Sir George Murray was one which hon. Members opposite and employers of labour should study. The recommendations of the Bradford Committee, he would point out, would if carried out cost two millions a year to the Treasury and another half million would be required to satisfy the claims which were not touched. But notwithstanding that important Committee, the next day he received, and hon. Members received, a protest against the Committee saying that the employees would never rest until they had a Parliamentary Committee. He mentioned this because he thought the House should back up the authorities in exercising what they consider proper and fair jurisdiction, and that if hon. Members would do as was done in Australia and disfranchise the postmen, and give them a member of their own, if they liked, it would be better for the country. That was one of the reasons why he hesitated about taking over the telephones when he considered that another 50,000 men would be added to the public service who would demand pensions and increased pay. He was sorry that his speech might be considered unbecoming and very unpopular. He was looked upon as a sort of Radical with regard to these matters. Still they had given during the last ten years large concessions to the postmen amounting to two and a half millions while they had only given to the public in concessions in post office facilities a sum equal to £55,000. He wished hon. Members on this occasion to be true to themselves and to take such measures as to secure that they should have fair play and not be intimidated by the enormous number of postal employees who might be a positive danger to the country in future.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said the speech which they had just heard was one which should have been delivered before the Committee was appointed and before the Report which they were there to consider that night was made. He reminded the hon. Member who had just spoken that the Committee who had reported to that House was not a Committee composed of Members of that House or one which could by any means be charged with being very favourable to the demands of the employees. It was a Committee of business men chosen by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer because they would present a fair and unbiassed Report. He regretted, in dealing with the Report before them, they had not had the advantage of hearing from the noble Lord what were the intentions of the Government with regard to it.

And it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee also report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

SUPPLY [22nd Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,615,509, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Working Expenses of the Post Office Telegraph Service."

Mr. NANNETTI, continuing his speech, said that when the House adjourned he was endeavouring to point out that what they had to discuss that evening was not the question raised by the hon. Member for Canterbury but the question of the Committee appointed by the Government to consider the question of the wages of the postal employees. The House would remember that when this question came before the Committee a year-and-a-half ago, when a Motion was moved to reduce the salary of the then Postmaster-General, it was alleged by those who moved and supported the Motion that the many grievances with which the postal servants had to contend should form the subject of an independent inquiry. At that time they were met by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer with the statement that their information was not correct, that the postal servants were a well-favoured body of men, and that if they had a grievance at all it was limited to the one question of wages. At that time a Committee was appointed by the right hon. Gentleman, which was opposed to these men, and which had now presented a Report to the House. Any person who had read that Report must admit that serious grievances did and do exist in the postal service. They had it laid down by that Committee whose members were free from outside pressure, that widespread discontent existed in the postal service. That Report, which was not asked for by the men, but which was rather taken by the men because they could get no other redress from the House, and because they knew the justice of their cause, had been issued, and they wanted to know whether the Government would accept the findings of their own Committee. They said the findings were not all they could wish, and the service journals said that they were only partial and did not meet the requirements of the men, but that they were prepared to accept that which had been proved by the findings that they were entitled to. Members on both sides of the House agreed that the cause for complaint had been made out, and they said that the Government was bound in honour to accept the findings of their own Committee, and that was what was asked. It was all nonsense for the hon. Member for Canterbury to call attention to what would be the result and expense of giving effect to that Report. The Committee said that at the present moment seething discontent existed. Was that a state of things that should exist in a public Department? It was the duty of the Postmaster-General to see that the men employed were contented and happy, and that there should be no cause for complaint. He hoped they should have no case of postponement. It was no answer to say that the remedy would cost an enormous sum of money, £2,000,000 the hon. Member for Canterbury said. Even if it did, the Post Office was a commercial undertaking and had worked at a profit. Last year the profit was over £4,000,000.

Mr. **HENNIKER HEATON** said there was a loss of £1,000,000 on the Telegraphs.

Mr. **NANNETTI** said even then it left a profit of £3,000,000. That being the case, the Government had no right to sweat labour and ought to pay fair wages. These men at one time rose to the occasion, but they saw that they were doing an injustice to the public, and did not resort to extreme measures. But now that a Committee had brought in a finding — a Committee suggested by the Postmaster-General — the claims of the men ought not to be refused. When he originally brought the case before the House he was speaking solely on behalf of the Irish portion of the service. The claims he then made had been verified by the Report. The claims as to dual work, split duty, and promotion in the Irish Office had all been backed by the Report. The one point dealt with was remuneration. In dealing with the recommendations in that Report, he asked the Postmaster-General not to lose sight of the unattached men and the engineers and linesmen. These must be considered before this question could be settled finally. Let them have a settlement of the question once and for all. It was all very well to say these men were recommended an increase of 4s. a week, but they were asked to give up their Christmas-boxes, a very considerable item. Certainly a further sum of 4s. per week would not be adequate remuneration for them. If postmen were asked to give up the considerable item of Christmas-boxes, the substitution of 4s. a week would not be an adequate recompense. It was unnecessary to labour the matter further. The point the House had to insist upon was that a Report had been presented by a Committee appointed by the Government, and what they asked was that the Government should give effect to the verdict pronounced against them by their own tribunal.

Sir **JAMES HASLETT** (Belfast, N.) said the reference to this Committee had very fairly been limited to the lower classes of servants, there having been no strong evidence that the higher departments required revision. In fact, it was generally conceded that the officials in the upper branch of the service had been favourably dealt with, and that those who were less fortunately placed in the matter of wages ought to be dealt with in a broad spirit. When the Committee was appointed, some misgivings were felt because the men had no direct representation thereupon, and the position of the men was made the stronger by the fact that an outside Committee, absolutely unconnected with the Department, and presumably altogether unbiassed, had brought in a verdict in favour of a revision of the pay of these younger officials. The statement of the hon. Member opposite with regard to Christmas-boxes was too true. They had grown into such an institution that the postmen calculated upon them as part of their income. That was a most unfortunate position for the servants of any public Department to be placed in. Whatever pay was necessary to support a man in his proper social position should be paid by his employer. Personally, he would not allow any of his employees to seek a Christmas-box or other favour from his customers, and if the Post Office undertook to deliver letters, and received a reasonable fee for so doing, their servants ought not to be paid afterwards by those who received the letters. Such a practice demoralised the servant, because, if the man did not receive the expected gift, he was naturally irritated against the person who withheld it. Therefore, he held very strongly that, whatever was done by the Postmaster-General in this connection, he should, once and for all, place the humbler servant in such a position, so far as pay was concerned, that there would be no inducement for him to humble himself by seeking Christmas-boxes or any other favours.

With regard to the general service, there were two or three ways in which this Committee recommended that the pay of the servants of the Post Office should be regulated. He had heard it stated that a small country town was more expensive to live in than a large town, and an hon. Member opposite had given that as his own experience. He did not think that that was the general impression. In the first place house rent was very much less in small country towns than in London. The question was how they could make the service of the Post Office a service that could be moved easily from place to place, because the man who had the capacity should have the avenue open to him to carry that capacity anywhere throughout the length and breadth of the land. There were two principles which they ought to fix in regard to that man. In the first place there should be a fixed pay for a definite service wherever the man was moved to. They must have a graduated scale of pay according to the cost of living in different places. Supposing they transferred a man from Belfast, and they found that there his lodgings were costing him 6s. or 8s. a week. If he came to London a similar lodging would cost him 10s. or 12s. a week. The fairest way was to make up for that by an extra allowance for the extra cost of living. That was one of the recommendations of this Committee, and it solved the problem by giving a fixed payment for a definite service, and then graduating the advantage according to the additional cost of living in the place to which the man moved.

With regard to the telegraphists, no man who went into a large telegraphic station could fail to be impressed with the enormous strain which was put upon the men. He thought it would be well for them all if now and again hon. Members paid visits to such stations to see what was actually going on. They should go into such stations at ten, eleven, and twelve at night, and about two and three in the morning, and see what pressure there was on the operators to get news over the wires in time for the morning papers, which hon. Members read, without much consideration for the cost of producing them, at their breakfast tables. He asked the Postmaster-General to remember the enormous strain there was on those engaged in such telegraphic departments. With regard to postmen they now and again found men prosecuted for wrongdoing in connection with the Post Office service; but he was bound to say that if they had regard to the enormous number employed in that Department, and the many temptations placed in their reach, that the service was wonderfully free from blemish. He did not know of any men who deserved their sympathy, and had merited their confidence, more than the servants in this great Department of the State.

A word with regard to the location of post offices. He might tell the Postmaster-General that he thought there was to some extent, especially in large towns, rather a niggardly disposition shown in respect to the locating of their post offices. There was a contriving to put them into shops and to let the shopkeepers have charge of them. Let them take such an office connected with the telegraph system. One merchant would have very great hesitancy in going into the shop of another merchant to deliver a telegram, of probably a very delicate nature connected with his business and markets, for fear of the temptation to the merchant connected with the post office to take advantage of his position, and use the information handed to him for transmission. The divisional post offices should be clear of such drawbacks, they should be under the jurisdiction of the Post Office and managed by Post Office officials. They should be entirely free from all trade and commerce and from the temptation that might arise in connection with trade interests and trade speculation. With regard to the houses he did not complain of the city of Belfast, because the postmaster and the medical officer of that place had always been willing to lend their assistance, and they had worked harmoniously together. The postmaster had even asked the assistance of the Public Health Department of the city in connection with the health of the workers in the Post Office buildings and the sanitary arrangements which were necessary for a large staff of men. Personally he did not see why Government offices should be free from inspection by the sanitary department, although he understood that the law laid down that they had no right to inspect for sanitary purposes any Government office. He thought he was right in saying that that was recognised as the law of the land. He was aware that they might have some pettifogging officer trying to show his petty authority by demanding that this and that and the other thing should be done in the office, but on the broad principle that every Department of the State should be kept in thorough sanitary order, he did not see why the due inspection of a Government office should be thwarted either by law or practice. A medical officer charged with the service of his country ought to have no personal desire to place any stumbling block in the way of carrying on Post Office work, and their only desire should be to see that Government offices were kept in the same good sanitary condition as they were in the habit of demanding in ordinary workshops in the city. He hoped the day had gone by when it would be held that a Government office where labour was employed should be exempted from the general inspection which applied to every other building where workmen were employed, and which was necessary to ensure, not only the health of officials, but also the general health of the community at large. In conclusion, he hoped the Postmaster-General was not going to give them a mere answer putting them off. They all knew the present Postmaster-General and esteemed him. Surely, if there was any meaning in the Committee's recommendations, they should be carried out. He earnestly asked the Postmaster-General to give a favourable reply to their appeals. He knew his heart would break if he had to say "no" to them that night. By his very genial countenance he thought the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to gratify their wishes or to say, "Gentlemen, I cannot put this question into the present financial year; but having appointed this Committee I feel honourably bound to carry out, not in every detail, possibly not to the maximum, their recommendations, but to carry out in a fair and generous spirit what has been recommended towards the improvement of a service of the State that deserves our sympathy and support."

*MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.) said the time was painfully and even absurdly inadequate to discuss this question when the Vote would be closured within half-an-hour. He desired, however, to raise two questions to which he hoped the Postmaster-General would be good enough to refer when he replied on the debate. One of these was: Is it the intention to reimpose an examination or technical barrier for telegraphists? The Postmaster-General would remember that this had been found both unsuccessful and unjust in the past, and two of his predecessors in office had condemned it. He asked the noble Lord to state what was intended to be done in that matter. The other point he wished to speak on related to the pay in certain areas. The pay in areas with a population of over 100,000 was to be higher than in other districts, and he would like to have an interpretation of the Committee's recommendation on that subject. In Wolverhampton the population was 95,712, but the total area served by the Post Office there contained a population of over 100,000. Was the higher pay to be given in such an area? Would not the noble Lord regard that as a special case under Clause 140 of the Bradford Committee's Report? There were other points in which he was interested, but he did not raise them simply because of lack of time.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said he had been referred to in this debate by the hon. Member for Canterbury, and he would take the opportunity of making one or two observations. He agreed in the main with the conclusions arrived at by the gentlemen who had signed this Report. He had never read a Report which seemed to him to be so thorough, so clear, and so convincing in its nature. At the same time he wished to register here his protest against methods that were pursued by Civil servants in attempting to practically coerce Members of Parliament into the acceptance of their case. It was perfectly true that a letter was written to him soon after he became a Member of the House suggesting, and articles were written in the Postal Service papers also suggesting, that he was practically a traitor, having broken pledges that he had given, He was glad to say that the Parliamentary Secretary of the Postal Clerks Association withdrew the charge upon the basis that he had not made a pledge. But means were used to belittle him because they did not like his acting with the Government on a particular occasion, and he made up his mind, as he had done many years ago when he saw the same thing exercised in Australia, that it would be a bad thing indeed for the Civil servants and purity of public life that Civil servants should be permitted to exercise undue influence upon Members of Parliament. He had no reason to retreat from that position. He agreed with the substance of this Report, but he was afraid the Postmaster-General was not going to consider these claims as favourably as he ought. The noble Lord would plead, he was sure, that this was a commercial organisation. Well, if it was, he saw no reason why the one milch-cow of the 'Government should be denied decent treatment. It seemed to him too much was expected of the Postal Department; and if efficiency of the public service was effected by parsimony on the part of the Postmaster-General then he thought it was time this the House made a protest, not because Civil servants invited them to do so, but because their claims were, he believed, just and sound. He therefore made his plea to the Postmaster-General to consider these claims, not only carefully, but with an eye to the fact that when the people of the country read the Report they would be convinced as he had been, and many of them had been, that the claims of these Civil servants were just and sound.

Before he closed he wanted to say a word about one class not yet mentioned in the debate that afternoon, namely, the women. Some years ago when considering the question of residences for educated women in London he went into the whole case of the living of women in London. If they examined this Report they would find that the females in this department were paid, at nineteen years of age, £52 a year, and it was impossible for a decent woman to live in London on that amount. He thought when the House came to examine such facts as those they must necessarily register their sympathy with the claims that had been made; but as to registering his vote against the Government upon this matter he would not do so for the simple reason that he would not be made in any sense the servant of the Civil servants of the State. He considered it an unsound thing. He agreed that these were questions that should be raised above the purview of the House and should be settled by a permanent Committee.

Lord STANLEY: I have allowed as many hon. Members to express their views as possible, but I feel the moment has come to reply to the criticisms that have been made on the Department over which I preside. The general run of the debate has undoubtedly been upon what we call the Bradford Committee, but there have been one or two subjects which I think it will be better to clear up before I come to the principal subject of the debate. The hon. Member for West Islington brought up the case of a man called Carless who was dismissed some years ago on the ground that there was a great suspicion, at all events, that he committed a theft. He has recently agitated, and I must say very fairly agitated, on his own behalf to clear himself of the accusation. He has put forward various statements both in writing to myself and in the Press which are not substantiated, and which are in fact contradicted by the records, but at the same time he has brought forward new facts which I think anybody in my position would be wrong to put quite aside and not take into consideration. Of course, it is very difficult to know what to do under such circumstances.

Probably it might have been better at the moment to have prosecuted the man and to have given him a chance to clear himself if he could; but that, of course, is out of the question now and I have to consider how I can do justice and at the same time exclude the man who was dishonest. I am entirely without bias in this case, and what I have decided to do is the only method that appears to me possible — to have the case thoroughly investigated by two gentlemen in the Post Office who have not been in any way intimately connected with the former decision, though, of course. they have seen the papers, and for him to be allowed to give the fullest possible explanation of his own conduct before them, and for the whole matter to be referred to me for my consideration and decision.

There are three other small matters that have been brought up. The hon. Member for Leicester brought up the question of the auxiliaries, who are apparently postmen one day and golf caddies another. These are matters very difficult to deal with, because the House will clearly recognise that there are times, Christmas, for instance, and in the summer at watering places, when we have to have extra men who would be redundant during the rest of the season; and it is quite impossible, therefore, to put these men on the establishment. The only thing we can do, and I think we may be able to, is, when these men are employed as auxiliaries, to see that they are paid excellent wages, and to do all that we can afterwards to put them on the establishment if possible. The hon. Baronet behind me has spoken of one other matter, and that was about the sanitary condition of the post offices. I do not know whether hon. Members have been in the House after twelve o'clock, but, if so, they will have seen my struggles to get the Post Office Sites Bill through, which only means that I want to supply sanitary offices in place of insanitary offices. They will recognise the amount of encouragement I am getting from the House when I have embarked upon such a project. The hon. Member mentioned the subject of Home Office inspectors inspecting these buildings. I cannot agree that it would be possible under all circumstances to allow such inspectors at all times and at all places to inspect the various post offices, but I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that, if he has any doubt as to the sanitary condition of any post office he should certainly employ such an inspector to give me a report.

I have now got rid of all subsidiary points, and I come to the main question, which is the dealing by the Department and the Government with the findings of the Bradford Committee. First of all I should like to refer to the speech of the hon. Member for one of the Ridings of Yorkshire. Although we try and hide it we must in time recognise that it is quite impossible for either side to go on for long if we are to be swayed in all these matters of increased wages by any political pressure that may be put upon us. It does not only refer to postmen. There is not a class receiving Government wages which will not, when it sees one class get an increase by agitation, at once try the same thing. All such questions as pay should be referred not to this House, where whatever we may preach we certainly do not practice—we always preach that we are not influenced by political motives—but should be referred to some judicial body, who could feel no outside influence and look at the matter as between employed and employer, with the object of giving to the employed those wages which in the open market a good employer would give to his employees, and at the same time protect the master, which is the Government here, from any outside influence. That being so, and being admitted I hope by the House, I feel a time may arise when both sides of the House should devote themselves to forming some such judicial body which shall be free from those circulars which we get imploring us to vote extra money for the employees of the Government. I mean a body whose action in the matter would be absolutely final; that is my idea of a judicial body. The hon. Member said he looked upon this particular Committee as having been a body of arbitrators whose Report we should accept as an arbitration award. The hon. Member may be perfectly right in so accepting it himself, but those who are mostly concerned, the employees of the Post Office, take a diametrically opposite view. In one of the circulars they kindly sent to me they said—

> "We must make it perfectly clear that we do not regard the Committee in any sense as an arbitration board."

which is rather against the argument of the hon. Member. With regard to ordinary circulars I cannot complain. Every man has a got a right, if he likes to circularise Members of Parliament as long as he thinks they are concerned with his prospects and future, but here is one circular I have objected to. A circular was sent round at the bottom of which was a paragraph which could be torn off which Members were asked to sign, telling him he ought to do this or that. Now I object to receive these recommendations. I am perfectly ready in such matters to receive any complaints or recommendations from the men themselves; they can send them to me straight, but hon. Members can give me their views and opinions in this House and in this House alone. I think no member of the Government ought to get those circulars; we ought to have their views straight from hon. Members themselves and not through any independent channel.

I will deal with some of the difficulties. In the first place, the Report does not comply with the reference because no comparison is made with the rates of pay current in other occupations. In other words, the Committee was asked to report upon the conditions of these men as compared with those of men in other trades in order that we might see for ourselves what position we were putting these men in in the social scale and might be told whether they were still as badly treated. The Committee did not do that. They expressly excluded that and took as the basis on which to form the Report, the numbers and character of those who offered and their contentment. They admit that the numbers of the men we get and their character is everything that could be desired, and that we get the right kind of men, but they add, granted these two things, they are discontented and you must raise their wages. I say that that is a direct premium on discontent. It is a direct encouragement to the men, to say we will give you everything we think right now, but if you agitate you will get more in the future. They went outside the reference because they propose a complete reorganisation of the whole of the office, including the overseers, and on this particular subject they took no evidence of any sort or kind. I admit that to a certain extent it is impossible to increase the pay without some reorganisation of the office, but the House will see the difficulty one is in, being asked to deal with the question when the whole of the increase of pay is practically wrapped up in the reorganisation of the whole system which employs 180,000 men.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): Will the noble Lord say whether he has any intention of adopting any of the recommendations?

LORD STANLEY: Hon. Members themselves pointed out some of the great difficulties that are contained in this Report. There is the question of Christmas-boxes, a small matter in itself, but yet it must be remembered that in this Report there is an increase of pay given on the distinct understanding that Christmas-boxes should be given up. Everybody agrees that these Christmas-boxes are not in accordance with the right principle and that they should be given up, but then we have an hon. Member coming down, speaking on behalf of those whom he represents, and asking not only that an increase of pay should be given, but that Christmas-boxes should be kept on.

MR. NANNETTI: I suggested nothing of the kind, I said that if you take away Christmas-boxes the equivalent should be given in lieu of what is taken away.

LORD STANLEY: What I understood the hon. Member to say was that an increase of pay should be given, and also some further equivalent in lieu of Christmas-boxes. That is different from the Report, and asks a considerable amount more. There is also the question of administration, the question of the senior men being made overseers. It would be quite impossible to put that into operation. Another question is the question of the areas. It is quite impossible to put that into operation. It does not follow that the increase of expenses over the normal is co-existent with the population of the town in which a man is placed. All these are points put before me with which I have to deal. I may have been considered to be unsympathetic, but that is not my intention. I quite admit that the Report has shown that there are increases that will have to be given. I quite admit that it has been shown that there are men in a position which it is not possible for a model employer to justify. An hon. Member has mentioned the subject of women employed by the Post Office. That is a question which certainly ought to be considered. Another is the question of rural postmen. All these are matters for consideration and I propose to go fully into the question in the autumn. The extent to which the country will be committed by these proposals will be over a million a year, and the House will think I am justified when I say that I require time to consider these proposals, and to bring the matter forward on the Estimates next year, and I can only say that I shal examine the Report and the proposals in it with the utmost consideration towards the men of the Post Office.

And, it being Ten of the Clock, the Chairman proceeded to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote under consideration.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 172; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 317.)

AYES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William Jones
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon, Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walfrd D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N.)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Lord Stanley.

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R.F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Doogan, P. C.
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harwood, George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan. W.
Kilbride, Denis
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Jacoby and Mr. Crooks.

The Chairman then proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order 15, to put severally the Questions, That the total amounts of the Votes outstanding in each Class of the Civil Service Estimates, including Supplementary Estimates, and the total amount of the Votes outstanding in the Estimates for the Navy, Army, and Revenue Departments, be granted for the Services defined in those Classes and Estimates.

CLASS I.

2. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,088,788, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
2. Osborne (including a Supplementary sum of £5,450) . . .	10,550
3. Royal Parks and Pleasure Grounds . .	69,100
5. Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain	40,700

6. Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain .	26,300
7. Diplomatic and Consular Buildings . .	38,000
9. Public Buildings, Great Britain . . .	290,900
10. Surveys of the United Kingdom . . .	120,409
12. Peterhead Harbour .	22,000
13. Rates on Government Property . . .	332,277
14. Public Works and Buildings, Ireland .	110,737
15. Railways, Ireland .	27,815
	£1,088,788."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 181; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 318.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N.)
Kenyon Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Harry
Loder Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stroyan, John

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxeth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, E. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Broadhurst and Mr. Cawley.

CLASS II.

3. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,263,014, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. House of Lords Offices .	9,868
2. House of Commons Offices	21,060
3. Treasury and Subordinate Offices . . .	54,639
4. Home Office . . .	104,094
5. Foreign Office . .	35,771
6. Colonial Office . .	27,750
7. Privy Council Office .	5,680
9. Mercantile Marine Services	69,251
10. Bankruptcy Department of Board of Trade .	9
11. Board of Agriculture and Fisheries . . .	54,337
12. Charity Commission .	14,633
13. Civil Service Commission	25,110
14. Exchequer and Audit Department . .	39,054
15. Friendly Societies Registry . . .	4,881
16. Local Government Board	142,089
18. Mint, including Coinage .	63
19. National Debt Office . .	7,439
20. Public Record Office .	14,965
21. Public Works Loan Commission . . .	7
22. Registrar General's Office	22,146
23. Stationery and Printing .	404,362
24. Woods, Forests, etc., Office of . . .	13,171
25. Works and Public Buildings Office . .	39,649
26. Secret Service . .	25,000
Scotland.	
27. Secretary for Scotland's Office . . .	10,495
28. Fishery Board . .	10,155
29. Lunacy Commission .	13,423

	£
30. Registrar General's Office . . .	2,732
Ireland.	
32. Lord Lieutenant's Household . .	2,826
33. Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices . .	14,371
35. Charitable Donations and Bequests Office (including a Supplementary sum of £130) . . .	1,148
36. Local Government Board	37,886
37. Public Record Office, Ireland . . .	3,254
38. Public Works Office .	21,773
39. Registrar General's Office . . .	6,716
40. Valuation and Boundary Survey . .	13,207
	£1,263,014”

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 183; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 319.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer. Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye

Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Corrie Grant and Mr. Higham.

Class III.

4. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,016,511, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Law Charges . . .	35,232
2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses . . .	22,199
3. Supreme Court of Judicature	177,515
4. Land Registry . .	28,827
5. County Courts . .	23,000
6. Police, England and Wales	25,854
7. Prisons, England and the Colonies . .	375,762
8. Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain . . .	113,957
9. Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum. .	21,701
Scotland.	
10. Law Charges and Courts of Law . . .	54,148
11. Register House, Edinburgh . . .	27,678
12. Crofters' Commission .	2,590
13. Prisons	50,570
Ireland.	
14. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions . .	33,416
15. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments . .	57,718

	£
17. County Court Officers, etc.	66,584
18. Dublin Metropolitan Police	37,961
19. Royal Irish Constabulary	739,608
20. Prisons	65,476
21. Reformatory and Industrial Schools . .	53,000
22. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum . . .	3,715
	£2,016,511"

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 183; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 320.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim. S
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Danenport, W. Bromley-
Davies Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon J. (Londonderry, South
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton Marq. of (L'donderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Joens, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Cloonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne

Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Russell Rea and Mr. Bright.

CLASS IV.

5. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,110,267, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services, included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Board of Education	5,238,437
2. British Museum	90,171
3. National Gallery	7,065
4. National Portrait Gallery	2,682
5. Wallace Collection	3,539
6. Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	24,407
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	103,200
8. Public Education, Scotland	1,003,724
Ireland.	
10. Public Education	633,625
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners	535
12 National Gallery	582
13. Queen's Colleges	2,300
	£7,110,267"

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 183; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 321.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Coloonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James

Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col, Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon, Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy, M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W.H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randall
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby James Alfred

Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn C.R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Joseph Leese and Mr. Slack.

Class V.

6. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,130,288, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Diplomatic and Consular Services . .	303,067
2. British Protectorates in Uganda, etc. . .	420,700
3. Colonial Services . .	305,421
4. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable . .	52,100
5. Treasury Chest Fund .	49,000
	£1,130,288."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 180; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 322.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.A (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N.)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Harry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt, Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Herbert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S,
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thamas
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackelton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Luke White and Mr. Lyell.

CLASS VI.

7. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £341,246, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Superannuation and Retired Allowances . .	339,729
2. Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions . . .	600
3. Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances	617
4. Hospitals and Charities, Ireland . . .	300
	£341,246"

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 181; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 323.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis(Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N.)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe,, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York., W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Joseph Walton and
Mr. Bell.

CLASS VII.

8. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £63,497, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz:—

	£
1. Temporary Commissions -	25,000
2. Miscellaneous Expenses -	5,098
3. Repayments to the Local Loans Fund - - -	5,642
4. St. Louis Exhibition, 1904 -	10,000
5. Ireland Development Grant	1,000
6. Repayment to Civil Contingencies Fund - -	16,757
	£63,497"

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 324.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner

Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords.N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Kennedy, P. J.(Westmeath,N.)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,David J.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt.Hon.Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy,Vincent P.(Cavan,W.
Langley, Batty
Leese, SirJosephF. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R.(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Tomkinson and Mr. Layland-Barratt.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

9. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,690,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Navy Services, viz.:—

	£
5. Educational Services .	154,000
12. Admiralty Office . .	327,400
14. Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances	1,208,800
	£1,690,200"

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 44. (Division List No. 325.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Fredk. George
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Benn, John Williams
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hn. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratio D.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir W. Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J(Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, HnJ E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J. F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsm'th)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W.F
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, RtHn. A. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Norman, Henry
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M.W.(Stalybridge)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)

Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Samuel, H. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt.Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Col. William George
Weir, James Galloway
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Delany, William
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt,Lewis V.(Rossendale
Higham, John Sharpe
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan,W
Langley, Batty
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Partingdon, Oswald
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Henry J. Wilson and Mr. Cremer.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

10. Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,984,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure on the following Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz.:—

		£
2.	Medical Establishment, Pay, etc.	484,000
3.	Militia: Pay, Bounty, etc.	817,000
4.	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances	468,000
5.	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances	1,220,000
6.	Transports and Remounts	1,519,000
7.	Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies	4,582,000
8.	Clothing Establishments and Services	1,156,000
10.	Works, Buildings, and Repairs: Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services	1,918,000
11.	Establishments for Military Education	146,000
12.	Miscellaneous Effective Services	73,000
14.	Non-effective Charges for Officers, etc.	1,666,000
15.	Non-effective Charges for Men, etc.	1,676,000
16.	Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities	189,000
	Army (Ordnance Factories)	70,000
		£15,984,000

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 178; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 326.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt. Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt.JoscelineFitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.GeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour,Kenneth R.(Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Fredk. George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James

Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.HnJ.A.(Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,Sir HoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning, Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson,RtHnSir J.(Manc'r)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene,W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope,J.F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N
Kenyon, Hn. Geo T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHnA Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M.W(Stalybridge)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Col. William George
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Chas. Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Harcourt,Lewis V.(Rossendale
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)

Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kennedy, Vincent P. (Cavan, W
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph J.
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt Hn. C R (Northants.)
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Warner and Mr. Higham.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

11. Question put, "That a sum not exceeding £536,420, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for Expenditure in respect of the following Service included in the Estimates for Revenue Departments, viz. :—

	£
Post Office Packet Service .	536,420

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 179; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 327.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A. (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elibank, Master of
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kennedy, P. J. (Westmeath, N.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Walter (Sal'sbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)

Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bell, Richard
Benn, John Williams
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Broadhurst, Henry
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V(Rossendale)
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kennedy, Vincent P.(Cavan, W.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F(Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, RtHnC.R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Charles Hobhouse and Mr. Partington.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE 1902-3.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz:—

(a.) That the gross expenditure for certain Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £388,335 5s. 7d., as shown in column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Navy Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £437,337 3s. 0d., as shown in column No. 2 of the said appended Schedule, so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Navy Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £49,001 17s. 5d.

(b.) That the receipts in aid of certain Grants for Navy Services fell short of the total estimated receipts by the sum of £4,598 15s. 4d., as shown in column No. 3 of the said appended Schedule, while the receipts in aid of other Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £207,119 8s. 0d., as shown in column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule, so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Navy Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £202,520 12s. 8d.

(c.) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

	£. s. d.
Total Surpluses . .	617,270 4 0
Total Deficits . .	365,747 13 11
Net Surplus .	£251,522 10 1

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Navy Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations in Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services.

1. Resolved, that the application of such sums be sanctioned.

Schedule.

Number of Vote.		Navy Services, 1902-1903. Votes.	Gross Expenditure.		Appropriations in Aid.	
			Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure. 1.	Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure. 2.	Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 3.	Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 4.
			£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1	...	Wages, etc. of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines - -	119,682 16 6	...	...	6,668 4 6
2	...	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy - - - - -	12,203 12 7	...	...	13,090 4 0
3	...	Medical Establishments and Services - - - - - -	..	4,575 15 0	1,083 0 6	
4	...	Martial Law - - - - -	437 17 5	...	45 8 7	
5	...	Educational Services - -	...	4,805 11 7	...	131 18 4
6	...	Scientific Services - - -	...	1,215 7 8	...	2,004 3 1
7	...	Royal Naval Reserves - -	...	22,764 2 1	35 6 5	
8		Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c. - - - - -				
	Sec. 1 ...	Personnel - - - - -	188,522 13 7	...	...	1,210 7 8
	Sec. 2 ...	Materiel - - - - -	...	243,960 11 7	...	132,921 4 11
	Sec. 8 ...	Contract Work - - - -	...	53,937 6 11	...	9,912 7 1
9	...	Naval Armaments - - - -	...	66,440 15 5	...	37,807 9 7
10	..	Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad - -	...	39,183 12 10	3,357 14 6	
11	...	Miscellaneous Effective Services - - - - - -	45,859 17 4	...	...	1,183 10 4
12	...	Admiralty Office - - - -	4,454 14 0	...	...	10 8 1
13	...	Half-pay, Reserved and Retired Pay - - - - -	...	454 19 11	...	745 8 0
14	..	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances - - -	6,584 9 8	...	...	1,434 2 5
15	...	Civil Pensions and Gratuities -	3,639 14 5	...	77 5 4	
		Amount written off as irrecoverable- - - - - -	6,949 10 1			
			388,335 5 7	437,337 3 0	4,598 15 4	207,119 8 0

Net Surplus, £49,001 17 5 Net Surplus, £202,520 12 8

Surplus surrendereed to the Exchequer - - - - £251,522 10 1

Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz :—

(a.) That the gross expenditure for certain Army Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £2,235,435 4s. 2d. as shown in Column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Army Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £2,266,558 17s. 4d., as shown in Column No. 2 of the said appended Schedule; so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Army Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £31,123 13s. 2d.;

(b.) That the receipts in aid of certain Army Services fell short of the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £523,014 8s. 7d., as shown in Column No. 3 of the said appended Schedule; while the receipts in aid of other Army Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £938,463 11s. 9d., as shown in Column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule; so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Army Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £415,449 3s. 2d.;

(c) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses -	2,613,688	15	8
Total Deficits -	2,167,115	19	4
Net Surplus	£446,572	16	4

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge as Exchequer Grants for certain Army Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriation in Aid, in respect of the same Services, and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services.

2. Resolved, that the application of such sums be sanctioned.

Schedule.

Number of Vote	Army Services, 1902–1903. Votes.	Gross Expenditure.		Appropriations-in Aid.	
		Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure. 1.	Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure. 2.	Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 3.	Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 4.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1	Pay, etc., of Army (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments) -	...	1,028,191 3 0	...	7,958 15 7
2	Medical Establishments: Pay, etc. - -	...	31,748 10 7	...	10,727 19 10
3	Militia: Pay, Bounty, etc. - - -	324,011 2 9	...	612 7 11	
4	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances -	...	248,246 2 10	...	73 1 2
5	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances -	23,391 15 2	...	...	1,672 1 3
6	Transport and Remounts - - - -	624,534 10 4	...	246,678 7 6	
7	Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies -	...	359,562 0 7	67,354 14 9	
8	Clothing Establishments, and Services -	...	402,078 19 10	...	207,828 6 10
9	Warlike and other Stores: Supply and Repair - - - - - - - -	...	182,606 9 3	27,700 12 3	
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs: Cost, including staff for Engineer Services -	670,280 2 6	...	...	185,595 14 1
11	Establishments for Military Education -	4,591 15 2	...	...	5,321 7 7
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	291,872 9 5	...	...	519,286 5 5
13	War Office: Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges - - - - - - - -	34,424 0 10	...	120 0 4	
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, etc. -	253,696 5 1	...	68,069 3 9	
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, etc.	...	12,532 1 6	112,464 17 1	
16	Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances - - - -	..	1,593 9 9	14 5 0	
	Balances irrecoverable - - - -	8,633 2 11			
		2,235,435 4 2	2,266,558 17 4	523,014 8 7	938,463 11 9

Net Surplus, £31,123 13 2　　Net Surplus, £415,449 3 2

Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer - - - - £446,572 16 4

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said there were certain items to which he desired to call attention, and especially an item of £279,000 partly for China and partly for Somaliland. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh!"] It might become hon. Members opposite to take no notice of expenditure, but on the Opposition side of the House they intended to look into the details of all this kind of expenditure which he agreed had already been passed, but which they had to examine with an eye to the future in order that the deficiences of the past might be noticed. The surplus which by this Resolution it was proposed to apply to the reduction of debt was £446,572, but really the sum dealt with under this Resolution was larger than that, because it consisted of surpluses amounting to £2,613,688 and deficits representing £2,167,115, which had been transferred from various Votes to meet the exigencies of the War Office during the period of the war. These transferences from one Vote to another amounted to 6 per cent. of the total expenditure of £79,000,000, and that was a large percentage for which some explanation should be given. All these transferences had been made subject to the consent of the Treasury, but it was clear from the Report of the Public Accounts Committee that that sanction had not always been obtained in the past! There were one or two things which he wished to point out to the Committee. There had been a large saving under the new Militia Reserve of £150,000, and this money was only saved in consequence of the failure of the proposals of the Secretary for India, which were not brought to a satisfactory conclusion. In the same way on the Yeomanry Vote a considerable sum of money had been saved because a number of men whom the Secretary of State hoped to enlist had failed to come up to his expectations. Then there was the item of £279,000 for expenses in China and Somaliland. He wished to know the proportions in which this amount was divided. Another item —of about £500,000—was for expenditure on buildings in South Africa, and he would like to know upon what buildings the money had been expended. He wished to know what buildings they were. He understood that there was going to be a reduction in the garrison of South Africa, and he wished to know exactly upon what buildings all this money had been spent. It could not have been spent upon barracks, because if there was to be no permanent garrison permanent barracks would not be required. The money might have been spent upon hutments. He noticed that in the current year £3,500,000 had been spent out of capital, and he wished to know exactly upon what class of building this money had been spent. They had a large Vote for barracks in this country, and surely out of that Vote sufficient money might have been found to build what barracks were required in South Africa.

He now came to an important point which concerned the Secretary for India. If hon. Members would look on page 2 of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee they would see there that the Secretary for War had sanctioned a payment to General Knox and his aide-de-camp of full allowances for periods extending from the 30th of October, 1902, to the 1st of January, 1903. At the time when the Secretary of State for India sanctioned these allowances to these two officers two other officers were actually doing the work for which General Knox and his aide-de-camp were being paid, When this question came up the Treasury refused to sanction the proposals of the Secretary of State, and they did so because there was a regulation which provided that staff pay should only be paid to an officer who was actually discharging the duties of his appointment. Neither of these two officers were actually discharging the duties for which they were being paid, because there were two other officers doing their work. The right hon. Gentleman thereupon used part of the £5,000 which, in accordance with the recommendation of the Dawkins Committee, he was allowed to spend on his own responsibility, thus getting outside the ruling of the Treasury and the wording of the pay warrant. Such a proceeding could not be passed over in silence, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give a satisfactory explanation. He did not like to suggest that the Secretary of State had abused his responsibility, but there was a point at which that responsibility should be checked, and this money ought to be spent only upon those objects for which it was granted.

The hon. Member asked several Questions with regard to remounts. Horses bought in America for $140 were sold two or three days afterwards for $42. The Remount Department at the end of the war lost £10 a head on horses bought in the open market in Hungary at from £12 to £15. Surely those horses in the open market were worth more than £5. There had disappeared 34.000 horses, costing on an average between £35 and £40, and 6,000 mules, costing on an average £25 to £30, and no trace of them could be found. Whether they were killed in action, or lost on the veldt, or disposed of by some crafty contractor was not known. There ought to be a more satisfactory account of their disappearance than the House had got. He hoped that care would be taken in future to see that a new system of accounting in the Army would be adopted, so that if they had again to embark on an enterprise of this magnitude they might have some security that the accounts would be better managed than they were at the present moment.

There was another unsatisfactory thing referred to in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. At page 6 the facts were set out in considerable detail. A large number of stores were got rid of at below the minimum price at which traders were invited to tender. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that a trial had taken place in South Africa in which the name of Colonel Morgan, a distinguished officer of the Army Service Corps, was introduced. It was stated that that officer himself profited from sales at prices considerably below the minimum. He understood that the matter was *sub judice* in this country. He wanted to know whether the War Office were going to wait until that trial was determined before they themselves instituted an independent inquiry with regard to what took place. There was one important point which, he thought, the Secretary of State for India would be delighted to clear up. The Committee said in their Report that they had learned that the reserve of ammunition in store was not at a higher standard than it was before the war. He remembered that the right hon. Gentleman was very curious on a former occasion as to the amount of ammunition kept in this country. A statement was made by the Prime Minister during the course of the war that there was not more than one box of ammunition in this country. Taking that statement in conjunction with the eagerness of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India on the subject, they might have anticipated a more favourable Report from the Committee. The Report also stated that 50,000,000 rounds of ammunition had been brought back from South Africa in bad condition. He hoped the Committee would hear that some effort had been made, or was being made, to remedy the injury to the country's finances resulting from the abandonment of that damaged ammunition.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that every one who read the Report of the Public Accounts Committee could not fail to come to the conclusion that the late Secretary for War was of a very arbitrary temperament. Again and again the Committee stated that the Regulations had been disobeyed, money had been spent without authority, and the sanction of the Treasury had not been obtained. In short, the Report from beginning to end was a sustained condemnation of the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India when he was Secretary for War. It had always been a mystery how the millions spent on the Army during that war had been got rid of; but now that mystery was explained in this Report. Stores had been obtained, and no account had been given of them; and in some cases, so far as the re-sale of stores was concerned, one could not avoid the belief that somebody was not acting in good faith. Take, for instance, the tobacco sent out to South Africa. 580,000 lbs. were disposed of on sale at 2d. per lb, while the price paid for it was 9½d. per lb. It was not because the tobacco was in bad condition,, because 980,000 lbs of tobacco were sold to Tommy Atkins at such a price as to recoup the loss on the other sale. In dealing with such a subject as tobacco, one would like to know why such a high price as 9½d. per lb. was paid for it? The ordinary price was only 5d. or 6d. per lb., and this tobacco must have been of very exceptional quality. Then it appeared that the Committee called attention to the quality of the oats which were re-sold at a loss of 1s. 6d. per quarter; although compensation had been given to certain contractors at the rate of 6s. 10d. per quarter. All these facts showed that there was no proper control over the expenditure of the Army. It was true that these accounts had now been passed by the Public Accounts Committee, but this Committee had a right to ask that there should be at least some pretence of businesslike conduct in the management of Army expenditure. At present there was no such pretence, and until the right hon. Gentleman could give the Committee some satisfactory explanation in regard to some of these details, they ought not to sanction the surplus expenditure now proposed.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (MR. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said that the hon. Gentleman's observations were devoted to the accounts for the war period.

MR. McKENNA: No; after the war as well.

MR. BRODRICK said that the whole point of the hon. Gentleman's observations were directed, as he understood, to the war period. It should be remembered that enormous supplies had, of course, to be ordered during that period. The War Office were obliged to order stores months in advance for 250,000 troops. As to the remounts, the orders were given on the opinion of the people on the spot. The only question was whether they should sell the horses on the spot, that was to say, at the places where they were in South Africa, and incur a loss, or ship the horses to this country at a large cost for transport and then find that the horses would be sold probably at a greater loss. In regard to other articles, such as tobacco, the military authorities were, of course, responsible, but he did not believe that they could have done other than they did. He could, of course, if the Committee desired it, enter into the various details. The Public Accounts Committee were, however, bound to take notice of any deviations; but it was impossible to conduct a great war without deviations. As to the 614 horses for the Yeomanry, they were bound to dispose of them at the termination of the war. The only other alternative was to take them over, and that would have necessitated the acquisition of a large amount of stabling accommodation, after which the horses might have been handed over to the Yeomanry in consideration of a certain payment. That would have meant trying, for the first time, a system of Government horses, which would be available for Government service at certain periods of the year. The accounts did not indicate any lack of capacity or any mismanagement on the part of the War Office; and he thought that the Department deserved a little more credit for its work during the two and a half years the war was being waged than hon. Gentlemen opposite were prepared to extend to it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that they could not criticise too closely the expenditure on a great war. They could not expect to have a perfect system under such circumstances of emergency; but that was not the point. The point was that a gross breach of the Regulations had been committed by the Department. The right hon. Gentleman had still to meet charges, brought very largely against him personally and against the Department, of gross breaches of the Regulations and unconstitutional practices. He had ignored absolutely what was done with regard to the military railways. There was an expenditure of £1,250,000 incurred without the authority of Parliament. Money was spent in 1902 in respect of the war, not merely without the sanction of Parliament, but without the sanction of the Treasury. The right hon. Gentleman did not ask the sanction of the Treasury, and, although Parliament sat until December, he made no attempt to obtain a Supplementary Estimate. Not until March, 1904, after the money had been spent, did Parliament hear anything about it. That was grossly unconstitutional procedure. As to the decentralisation and Army Corps accounts the action revealed by the Report constituted one of the grossest things of the kind that he had seen. The Army Regulations prescribed that a man should not draw pay except in respect of duties he was actually discharging. The officers concerned were promoted from one appointment to another; they certainly could not discharge the duties of both. The Treasury disallowed the payment, but the right hon. Gentleman, in defiance both of the Treasury and of the Regulations, appropriated the money out of the fund given for a totally different purpose. The right hon. Gentlemen was "a defaulting authority," and if he had been a Welsh county council a coercion Bill would have been introduced forthwith. Some defence ought really to be given of this extraordinary proceeding. The incident indicated the way in which the spending Departments treated the Treasury. There was no real supervision over the expenditure of any of the Departments. The surpluses themselves ought to have been enormously greater. The stores were sold under conditions which practically forced the Government to accept any price that was offered. The money of the taxpayer had been squandered without any proper scrutiny, and no defence whatever was forthcoming.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) complained of the discussion of so important a question having to be taken at one o'clock in the morning, but it was nevertheless the duty of the Committee carefully to consider the matter. There was considerable force in the plea of the right hon. Gentleman that under the pressure of war irregularities were certain to occur, but when in the year after the war there was an actual mistake on the two sides of £4,750,000 in the Army Estimates and Accounts, it was necessary that attention should be drawn to the fact. The right hon. Gentleman's explanation was not satisfactory. There were many points deserving of severe condemnation. On the question of waste and extravagance the right hon. Gentleman had entirely failed to meet the points raised by the hon. Member for Bristol with regard to the disappearance of 40,000 horses and mules and the re-sale of Hungarian horses at a loss of £10 apiece. But the more serious matter was the personal action of the Secretary of State in regard to Sir C. Knox and the Imperial Railways. According to the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, the Treasury objected to certain proposed payments to Sir C. Knox and another officer, but the right hon. Gentleman nevertheless proceeded to make the payments out of funds never intended for the purpose. That was a most irregular proceeding which not even the pressure of war, had it existed, could have justified. As to Imperial Railways, £1,250,000 was paid without any sanction whatever, and, as had appeared from recent discussions, £900,000 of that money was practically lost.

MR. BRODRICK pointed out that in the discussion referred to the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given a most elaborate explanation of the transaction, and had taken upon the Treasury the whole responsibility.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that as a matter of fact five different explanations had been given and they now had a sixth. But the deed was done, and they could only hope that what had transpired would be taken to heart by the War Office. If the Secretary of State for War would apply his mind to these somewhat minor matters instead of to extensive Army schemes, there might be in future some remedy for what he could only describe as a disgraceful state of things.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield) said the hon. Member had done his right hon. friend an injustice in charging him with the responsibility for the payment of the salaries of Sir C. Knox and the other officers in question. If any one was primarily responsible for that it was he himself.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he went by the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, page 2.

*MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT said that shortly after he went to the War Office he found that Sir C. Knox had been in receipt of pay which the Treasury had disallowed. The question was not whether or not the War Office proposed to give Sir C. Knox certain pay, but whether or not Sir C. Knox should be called upon to refund money which had been paid to him as salary in connection with the post to which he had been appointed. Whether or not the appointment was wrongly made, he thought it would be extremely unjust upon Sir C. Knox to require the repayment, and he represented this view to the Treasury, who, however, remained obdurate. He then asked the Treasury, in the name of his right hon. friend, whether, having regard to the circumstances of the case, they would allow the money to be paid out of the £5,000 allowed to the Secretary of State. The reply was that the £5,000 was granted to the Secretary of State for any expenditure he thought fit to incur, and from that he took it that they raised no objection. After having been paid this money it would be extremely unfair to call upon him to refund it. With regard to the £5,000 which had been referred to, it had been most jealously and carefully administered. Every single payment out of that sum came under his own personal observation, and the Committee might rest assured that he would not allow a single penny of that money to be expended unless he was perfectly certain it was being expended under the conditions laid down by the Treasury and in such a way as the Public Accounts Committee would have no reason to complain of.

With reference to the Imperial military railways he wished to point out that there was no necessity for obtaining either the sanction of Parliament or the Treasury so long as the money was being expended as a war charge for transport, and the other necessities of military operations in South Africa. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had already informed the House that he regarded the delay in coming to Parliament for sanction as a bad precedent which ought not to be repeated, and he should have thought that that statement would have ended the matter. He could not add anything more to what had already been said upon this point by his right hon. friend. The hon. Member for Bristol had stated that now for the first time the Comptroller and Auditor-General had obtained the consent of the Treasury for all the expenditure contained in the Appropriation Account, but it was not so. What the Public Accounts Committee's Report stated was "That the Auditor-General, in accordance with the wish of your Committee, declares that no part of the expenditure in these Apropriation Accounts has been incurred without the authority of Parliament." The hon. Member opposite had asked what class of buildings this money had been spent upon in South Africa. The money had been spent mainly upon hut accommodation and bungalows for married officers. With regard to remounts, this again was a loss consequent upon the war. When the war came suddenly to an end they had to sell the horses for what they would fetch. This necessarily involved very heavy loss. The hon. Member referred to them as having possibly been lost on the veldt. They were not lost at all. There were 174 units in South Africa, chiefly Irregulars, who failed to give any account at all of their animals. It was most desirable that in future better supervision should be kept over these matters, and that arrangements should be made for accountants accompanying the troops when on service. That matter was engaging the attention of his right hon. friend, and he was sure that provision would be made for it.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said the double payment referred to in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee was all due to the tremendous haste of the Secretary of State for India to get his Army Corps scheme adopted and to his having appointed men and paid their salaries when they had no duties to perform. That scheme had now been entirely swept away by his successor at the War Office. A question which had never been answered was whether the Treasury refused to sanction the appointments at the time they were made in October, 1902, for, of course, that was the point on which the whole thing turned. This was a somewhat serious matter, because the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, which was signed by supporters of the Government, stated that the Committee agreed with the Comptroller and Auditor-General that this was an abnormal and unusual payment. His hon. friend the Member for East Bristol was justified in bringing this to the notice of the House. Another matter on which the Committee should get some information was the immense amount of money which had been paid to the Chartered Company and of which very little had been accounted for. There was a sum of £1,728,000 which had been so paid, and the Report stated that there had been continual complaints that no vouchers had been forthcoming for a very large proportion of the payments. He was very glad that the Public Accounts Committee spoke very strongly against the handing over of large sums of money to commercial companies like this, or to outside bodies of any kind whatever. As showing the way business was carried on he might mention that there was a cargo of 999 mules shipped to Beira and of these 158 died on the voyage, while the remaining 841 could not be traced. A contract for oats was entered into by the War Office and afterwards cancelled, and the contractors received compensation at the rate of 6s. 10½d. per quarter though at the time the order was cancelled a quantity of oats which had already been delivered was resold at a loss of only 1s. 6d. per quarter. Surely it would have been better to have allowed the contract to be fulfilled, and then to resell the oats.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said that as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, he wished to say a few words on a subject which had not been touched upon. The first Report of the Committee dealt specially with this Vote, and, therefore, he had no hesitation in submitting a quotation from it. The Report referred to the practice of transferring the savings on one Vote to meet the deficiencies on another, thereby, in many cases, going behind Parliament, and setting up new services which Parliament had never sanctioned. The Report contained the following—

> "Your Committee feel that they must call attention to the constant practice of obtaining Treasury Authority for the application of Savings under one Vote to meet the deficiency on another and a totally different Service. In the case of Civil Service Votes, this can only be done to the extent of applying the Savings under one sub-head of a Vote to meet the deficiency under another sub-head, and there is nothing unconstitutional in this practice, as the formal vote of the House of Commons applies only to the total amount of each Estimate, though we are of opinion that even here the Treasury should exercise care that the money is not spent in any way which seriously differs from the details presented to Parliament. But the case of the Navy and Army Votes is very different. Here the Departments may, with the consent of the Treasury, spend in a manner entirely at variance with the grants as voted by the House of Commons, and they may even start a new Service not contemplated when the Votes were passed. This practice appears to us to be growing, and we think that the attention of the House of Commons should be called to it as seriously affecting the control of Parliament over the public expenditure. During the years 1902-3, savings amounting to about £568,000 have been applied to meet deficiencies reaching the aggregate sum of £345,000. In 1901-2, the savings were £230,000, and the deficiencies £142,000; and in 1900-1, these amounts were respectively £276,000 and £265,000."

The Committee proceeded to point out that in 1901 the amount so dealt with was £541,000; in the following year, £374,000; and in the year under review, £913 000. This was not so much a grievance on the part of the Treasury as on the part of the House of Commons. The Public Accounts Committee had had this matter before them for many years, but they had never made such pointed reference to it as they had done in this Report. The Public Accounts Committee said that this practice had gone much too far. Without discussing this point any further he asked that this question should receive the very serious attention of the Government and that in future years some regard should be had to the Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

Resolutions to be reported this day.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, the sum of £73,083,164, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he might take this opportunity of asking the First Lord of the Treasury how far he meant to go with business at that time of the morning?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) said it was all a question of balance of convenience. He understood that no length of time would be occupied in discussing the Eleventh Order, Education (Local Authority Default) Bill. He did not propose to take the Committee on the Cunard Agreement Bill. He hoped there would be no difficulty on the score of the Indian Councils Bill and there were several other measures of minor importance which he thought the House might agree to.

***Mr. MACVEAGH** (Down, S.) said he hoped the First Lord would not take the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. They had had a Coercion Act in Ireland since 1881 with subsequent amending Acts, and year after year they were continued in force by being smuggled through the House under the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill at three o'clock in the morning. The Irish Members thought that if this Bill was to be passed they should have an opportunity of entering their protest at a time when they could fairly discuss and when the House could understand the Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he hoped the hon. Member would remember that, however objectionable these Acts seemed to him, and in some respects to others, the Government were only following the universal practice in including them in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) asked if the Government intended to take Order No. 13 that night.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that it was not proposed to take that Order; but he hoped the hon. Gentleman would facilitate the passage of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would give facilities for the Criminal Aliens Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 126, Noes, 33. (Division List No. 328.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGerald W. (Leeds
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain RtHn. J. A. (Worc.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hon. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, DavidJ. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, Rt, Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry

Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Caldwell, James
Delany, William
Doogan, P. C.
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Ffrench, Peter
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kilbride, Denis
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Norman, Henry
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. MacVeagh and Mr. Boland.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

INDIAN COUNCILS BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [1st June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) asked the Secretary of State for India if he would explain the purpose of the Bill.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) was understood to explain that the Indian Government had a right to appoint by statute an additional member of the Indian Council. At present the work had to be done by five members, but the duties had so increased that they were absolutely beyond the compass of the existing members. One had broken down seriously in health, and had had to return to England. This Bill simply enabled the Government so to divide the duties that they could be properly discharged and the present members relieved.

Mr. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) expressed his doubts whether the salary of an additional member was justified. India was an extremely poor country; and she was overburdened with enormous salaries, many of which might with great advantage be considerably cut down.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) asked why, if there was such a pressure of business in India, advantage had not been taken of the services of a member of the Indian Council who some time ago was sent to act as Under-Secretary for Ireland.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill,"

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) moved to report Progress in order to ascertain how far it was intended to proceed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press his Motion. A period of the session had now been reached when every Leader of the House was obliged to ask Members to make sacrifices in order to carry annual Bills which it was necessary to pass, within which category the Bill under discussion came. Under these circumstances he ought not to be asked to postpone the Bill night after night, especially as it raised no new questions of principle.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) protested against the Bill being proceeded with, inasmuch as it was not mentioned in the list of measures which the right hon. Gentleman had announced his intention of taking, and a number of Nationalist Members had consequently left the House under the impression that the Bill would not come on. He suggested that the Bill should be taken at an hour when it might be reasonably discussed.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory) joined in the appeal which had been made. Among the measures included in the schedule was a Coercion Act for Ireland, the most peaceful portion of the United Kingdom, and it would be the duty of the Nationalist Members to offer to the Bill their strongest opposition.

MR. MCKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) agreed that sacrifices must be made to get through the necessary Parliamentary business; the question was simply as to the form those sacrifices should take. Should they sit until four or five o'clock, going through the Bill clause by clause; or should they meet on Monday or Tuesday next week? Personally, he did not mind which they did, but for the sake of the House generally he thought it would be wiser and probably in the interests of business to proceed, not with this Bill, but with others of a non-contentious character.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry S.) supported the Motion. The measure in which Nationalist Members were particularly interested stood 25th on the list, but they would probably have a good deal to say before that item was reached.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that this Bill was included in the list of measures with which he had said he intended to proceed that night, and he thought hon. Members were rather unreasonable in pressing the Motion to report Progress.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said that two alternative sacrifices had been mentioned, but there was a third, viz: the sacrifice of some of the fifty-two Orders still on the Paper. If the right hon. Gentleman would state definitely which were to be proceeded with it might tend to shorten proceedings.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) asked whether the Bishoprics Bill was to be proceeded with.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not to-night.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he meant during the session, because that would have some effect upon the manner in which the discussion was conducted.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 36; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 329.)

AYES.

Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Delany, William
Doogan, P. C.
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Ffrench, Peter
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kilbride, Denis
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Norman, Henry
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. William M'Arthur and
Mr. Causton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood
and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes

Clause 1.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he had an Amendment to move in regard to Clause 1.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The Question is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL said he understood that the Deputy-Chairman simply called out "Clause 1."

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The only Question before the Committee is that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he did not wish to go into all the reasons which might be alleged against this clause. At this late hour of the morning it was impossible for them to examine which Bills in the schedule it was desirable to continue, and which ought to be expunged. Therefore he moved that Clause 1 be struck out.

MR. MACVEAGH thought the Motion of his hon. friend, was an eminently reasonable one. The schedule contained some very goods Bills, but most of them were bad Bills. It was absurd to ask the Committee to legislate upon such subjects as the Ballot Act. the Corrupt Practices Act or the Sunday Closing Act at this late hour of the morning. The bad Bills ought to be dropped out altogether and the good ones made permanent. Nobody would ever dream, for instance, of proposing the repeal of the Ballot Act, and the same argument applied to the Corrupt Practices Act. Then there was the Sand Grouse Protection Act. He was not aware that any of his hon. friends from Ireland were interested in a Bill of that kind.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot enter into a discussion of these points upon the first clause. That will not be in order until we reach the schedule.

MR. MACVEAGH said that without going into particulars he would state that the whole schedule was put together in a slipshod manner. It was twenty-nine years since Mr. Disraeli and the late Lord Salisbury both gave public pledges that the system of re-enacting these Acts from year to year would be abandoned, but no serious effort had been made to carry out those pledges by the Leaders of the House. He ventured to say that the Solicitor-General for Ireland, the Solicitor General for England, or any of the other lawyers in the House had not the slightest idea of what they were voting for. Not one of them could give an intelligent definition of the measures mentioned in the schedule. He suggested that a Committee should be appointed to separate the wheat from the chaff before they gave facilities for the passing of the Bill.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he would vote for the Amendment as a protest against taking the discussion of the Bill at this unreasonable hour. The Committee had made good progress, and nobody could say that there had been any undue talking on the proposals which had been brought before the House.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 35. (Division List No. 330.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hon J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Keswick, William

Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M.W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wrightson Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Delany, William
Doogan, P. C.
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Ffrench, Peter
Griffith, Ellis J.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kilbride, Denis
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Norman, Henry
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Tully Jasper
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Charles Hobhouse and Mr. Corrie Grant.

Clause 2—

Motion made, and Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 35. (Division List No. 331.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bingham, Lord
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Sir Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Ailwyn-Fellowes.

NOES.

Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bright, Allan Heywood
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Delany, William
Doogan, P. C.
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Moss, Samuel
Norman, Henry
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Tully, Jasper
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Kilbride and Mr. Ffrench.

Schedule—

MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby) said he wished to move the omission of the first Act, which, he said, contained regulations regarding the flax and linen industry in Ireland which were absurd and inapplicable to the methods of to-day.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, to leave out lines 6 to 9, inclusive."—(*Mr. Higham.*)

Question proposed, "That the lines proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

MR. MACVEAGH thought that, in view of the declaration of an hon. Member well acquainted with the linen trade that there was not a single clause of this particular Act to which the slightest attention was now paid, a conclusive case had been made out for the omission of the Act from the schedule. Having himself a fair experience of the Irish line trade, he had come to the conclusion that the Act was obsolete. It was absolutely ludicrous that the House of Commons should be kept sitting at three o'clock in the morning to re-enact a statute at which everybody in the trade concerned was laughing. The whole of the North of Ireland was defying this Act, and he submitted that it should be either enforced or repealed.

MR. DELANY thought that some explanation ought to be given for the inclusion of an Act passed seventy years ago for a purely temporary purpose. He protested against the time of the House being wasted by the re-enactment of measures of this character.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said the illustration brought forward by the hon. Member for the Sowerby Division justified a close examination of this schedule. The deliberate policy of the particular Act referred to must have been to restrict the Irish linen trade. Five amending Acts had been passed, but no explanation had been given as to the extent to which they affected the principal Act. The schedule contained ninety-one Acts and it certainly ought not to be passed without any explanation whatever. The provisions of the Linen Manufactures Act were an absolute impossibility. If the measure had been amended an explanation ought to be given, if it had not been amended, it ought to be enforced; if it was not necessary it ought to be repealed.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said that not only had this Act been amended four times, the last occasion being in 1867, but by the Statute Law Revision Act, 1874, all the obsolete and mediæval clauses were repealed. All the statutes could not be codified year by year, and the Expiring Laws Continuance Act was a convenient method by which to perpetuate those parts of legislation which were still of use. It was really absurd to waste time by discussing provisions which had long since been repealed.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) submitted that the Act of 1867, so far from repealing, extended the Act of 1835, and enlarged the area of the anomalies to which reference had been made. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment spoke from the point of view of the textile manufacturers; he desired to speak as a lawyer who wished to have the law in such a form that it could be reasonably understood by ordinary people. The Linen Manufactures Act was passed in 1835; it was being continued in the schedule of this Act; four amending Acts had been passed, the last of which was carried in 1867, since when nothing had been done. Therefore a manufacturer who wished to see how the law stood had to get five Acts, to read them together and to consider their bearing one upon another. Surely the Law Officers of the Crown might go through this schedule from year to year and consider which it was necessary to continue, which could be dispensed with, and which might to some extent be codified. This particular Act was of no use whatever; it was probably originally intended to hamper Irish trade, and therefore there was the best possible reason for getting rid of it. The only result of such legislation was to create in the minds of students of Parliamentary proceedings an impression of incompetency on the part of the House to deal with the work it had to do. The ordinary theory of the incompetent outsider was that the more statutes there were and the more complicated they were the better it was for the lawyers. He wished to point out that that was not the case.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not in order in discussing the general codification of the law.

MR. CORRIE GRANT said he was simply endeavouring to point out how difficult it was for working lawyers, who had to consider laws of this kind, to do justice to their clients.

*THE CHAIRMAN: But that question does not arise here.

MR. CORRIE GRANT said that all he wished to say on this point was that lawyers did not desire to have complicated laws.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has repeated this argument several times after I have informed him that he is not in order. I must call the hon. Member's attention to the Standing Order in regard to irrelevancy.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.) appealed to the Prime Minister not to press this Bill further at this late hour. The Bill to which they were objecting was passed in order to crush out the linen industry in Ireland, and it was nothing more nor less than prohibitive legislation. At one time the linen industry was carried on principally by means of hand-looms, and at that period he did not think there was even one large linen house in Belfast. This Bill was ridiculous and absurd, they were breaking this law every day in Ireland, and if they did not break the law they could not compete with other manufacturers and send their linen all over the world. Surely in the interests of the linen trade of Belfast it would be wise to drop this Act. It was an act which was inoperative, useless, and prohibitive to industry, and it was enacted at a time when the most primitive handlooms were in use. So much ridicule had been thrown upon this Act that it ought never to have been put in the schedule again. The amending Act had not altered its character. He ventured to assert that there was not a single right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench opposite who had even read this Act through. He trusted that under these circumstances the Prime Minister would not proceed further with the Bill to-night, but allow them to retire to their virtuous beds. He hoped the First Lord of the Treasury would allow this measure to be withdrawn altogether. The Law Officers of the Crown should look into this Bill with the view to all obsolete Acts being left out.

MR. MACVEAGH said he could hardly conceive that the First Lord of the Treasury would ask them to continue this discussion till three or four o'clock in the afternoon. He remembered an occasion not very long ago when the feelings of Members were strongly worked up by this method of dealing with business. He did not wish a similar state of confusion to arise now. He moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. MacVeagh.*)

MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that in the interest of the general business of the House an arrangement should be come to by which this Bill should be held over to another time. He suggested that the House should agree to the following non-contentious Bills being disposed of now: Public Health Bill (Second Reading); Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill (Committee); and Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 2) Bill (Second Reading).

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not see why they should not come to the arrangement suggested by the hon. Gentleman provided it was thoroughly understood that the three Bills mentioned should be now disposed of, and that this Bill on another night would only be discussed at reasonable length. [Cries of "Hear, hear!"] He would offer no opposition to the Motion to report Progress.

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

FALSE STATEMENTS (COMPANIES) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

NAVAL AND MILITARY MEDALS BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL [LORDS].

Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

POOR LAW AUTHORITIES (TRANSFER OF PROPERTY) BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; Bill read the third time, and passed.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) (No. 2) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

Whereupon, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 2nd day of August, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty - eight minutes before Four o'clock, a.m.

[APPENDICES.]

APPENDIX

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXXXIX.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Army Council [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 2^a 29th July (71) Committee Report 4th Aug. (840) Read 3^a and passed 5th Aug. (1208)
*County Courts [H.L.]	*Earl of Halsbury*	Report 29th July (75) Read 3^a and passed 1st Aug. (250)
County of Suffolk	*Earl Cadogan*	Read 2^a 2nd Aug. (396) Committee Report 9th Aug. (1495)
*Dean Forest	*Marquess of Salisbury*	Read 3^a and passed 29th July (75)
*Electric Lighting (London)	*Lord Wolverton*	Read 2^a 2nd Aug. (397) Committee Report 5th Aug. (1095) Read 3^a and passed 8th Aug. (1328)
*Finance	*Marquess of Lansdowne*	All Stages 29th July (4) Royal Assent 1st Aug (161)
Leeds University	*Marquess of Ripon*	Read 1^a 2nd Aug. (398) Read 2^a 4th Aug. (844) Committee Report 5th Aug. (1095) Read 3^a and passed 8th Aug. (1328)
Licensing	*Lord Belper*	Read 1^a 29th July (45) Second Reading 1st Aug. (164) " " 2nd Aug. (398) Committee 4th Aug. (848) " 5th Aug. (1105) Report 8th Aug. (1287) Read 3^a and passed 9th Aug. (1496)

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought-in by	Progress.
*Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) [H.L.]	*Lord Kenyon*	Committee 29th July (76) Report 1st Aug. (250) Read 3^a and passed 2nd Aug. (505)
*Post Office	*Marquess of Londonderry*	Read 1^a 1st Aug. (164) Read 2^a 5th Aug. (1105) Committee Report 8th Aug. (1328) Read 3^a and passed 9th Aug. (1539)
*Post Office Sites		Read 1^a 9th Aug. (1539)
Registration of Clubs (Ireland)	*Earl of Denbigh*	Commons Amendments considered 2nd Aug. (398)
Re-vaccination [H.L.]	*Duke of Northumberland*	Read 3^a and passed 5th Aug. (1095)
*Savings Banks Act Amendment	*Marquess of Salisbury*	Royal Assent 1st Aug. (161)
Supply of Electricity [H.L.]	*Lord Wolverton*	Committee Report 8th Aug. (1328)
University of Liverpool	*Earl of Derby*	Read 1^a 1st Aug. (164) Read 2^a 2nd Aug. (397) Committee Report 4th Aug. (844) Read 3^a and passed 5th Aug. (1095)
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Earl of Kintore*	Read 1^a 29th July (77) Read 2^a 4th Aug. (844) Committee Report 5th Aug. (1091) Read 3^a and passed 8th Aug. (1328)
Wild Birds Protection Acts Amendment (St. Kilda)	*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*	Committee Report 29th July (74) Read 3^a and passed 4th Aug. (844)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Army Council [H.L.]	*Mr. Arnold Forster*	Read° 1 8th Aug. (1379)
*Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 9th Aug. (1076)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Bishopric of Bristol [H.L.]	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1486)
*Capital Expenditure (Money).	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Read 1° 3rd Aug. (829) Read 2° 8th Aug. (1479)
*Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland)	*Mr. Atkinson*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
*Congested Districts (Scotland)	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
*Constabulary (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1487)
*County Courts [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 2nd Aug. (541)
Criminal New Trials	*Mr. Bonsfield*	Read 1° 8th Aug. (1379)
*Crown Lands	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1083)
*Cunard Agreement (Money)	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Read 1° 3rd Aug. (836) Read 2° 8th Aug. (1470)
*Dean Forest	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Consideration of Lords Amendments 2nd Aug. (541)
*Dogs	*Mr. Fellowes*	Bill withdrawn 9th Aug. (1485)
*Education (Local Authorities Default)	*Sir W. Anson*	Committee Report 5th Aug. (1220) Read 3° and passed 9th Aug. (1691)
*Education (Scotland)	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1487)
*Expiring Law Continuance	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Read 1° 1st Aug. (284) Read 2° 4th Aug. (1079) Committee 9th Aug. (1693)
*False Statements (Companies)	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 9th Aug. (1706)
*Finance	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Royal Assent 1st Aug. (251)
*Government Ships	*Mr. Pretyman*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1488)
*Indian Councils	*Mr. Brodrick*	Read 2° 9th Aug. (1691)
*Isle of Man Customs	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Second Reading 5th Aug. (1276)
*Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1487)
*Justices of Peace [H.L.]	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Bill withdrawn 9th Aug. (1706)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Juvenile Smoking	*Mr. Rigg*	Read 1° 4th Aug. (1002)
*Land Tax Commissioners Names	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1487)
Leeds University	*Mr. Barran*	Read 2° 29th July (160) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 1st Aug. (391)
*Licensing	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Read 3° and passed 29th July (90)
*Local Authorities (Treasury Powers)	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
*Lunacy	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
*Marine Insurance	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1485)
*Married Womans Property Act (1882) Amendment	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1083)
*Naval and Military Medals	*Mr. Arnold-Forster*	Bill withdrawn 9th Aug. (1706)
*Naval Prize [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1083)
*Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site)	*Mr. Lee*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
*Penal Servitude	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1083)
*Police Superannuation	*Mr. Cochrane*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
*Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property)	*Mr. Walter Long*	Read 2° 8th Aug. (1487) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 9th Aug. (1706)
*Port of London	*Mr. Gerald Balfour*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1486)
*Post Office	*Lord Stanley*	Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 29th July (159)
*Post Office Sites	*Lord Stanley*	Committee Report 5th Aug. (1274) Read 3° and passed 8th Aug. (1487)
*Provisional Order (Marriages)	*Mr. Cochrane*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1486)
*Public Health	*Mr. Walter Long*	Bill withdrawn 9th Aug. (1706)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Public Works Loans	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Read 1° 1st Aug. (284)
Registration of Clubs (Ireland)	*Mr. O'Neill*	Consideration of Lords Amendments 29th July (160)
*Sale of Butter	*Mr. Fellowes*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
Savings Banks Acts Amendment	*Sir Albert Rollit*	Royal Assent 1st Aug. (251)
*Sea Fisheries [H.L.]	*Mr. Fellowes*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
*Shop Hours	*Mr. Cochrane*	Report 5th Aug. (1269)
*Site for Duke of Yorks School	*Lord Balcarres*	Bill withdrawn 8th Aug. (1487)
*Solicitors	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084)
University of Liverpool	*Sir John Brunner*	Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 29th July (159)
*Valuation	*Mr. Walter Long*	Bill withdrawn 4th Aug. (1084
*Whale Fisheries (Scotland)	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Read 1° 9th Aug. (1567)

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1904.

JULY 29—AUGUST 9.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen, Earl of

Licensing Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 470-474; *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 940.

Aberdeen City Improvements Order Confirmation Bill

l. 1R.* 2R. and *Com.** *July 29*, 2.
3R.* *Aug. 4*, 838.
c. 1R.* *Aug. 4*, 952.
*Con.** *Aug. 5*, 1210.
3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1330.

Aberdeen Joint Passenger Station Order Confirmation Bill

l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork Co., N.E.]

Kingston Estate — Applications from evicted Tenants for reinstatement, *Aug. 9*, 1564.

Mitchelstown Fair Rent Appeal—Reason for raising rent of Mr. P. Ahern, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1565.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1262, 1267.

Accidents

Americanisation of British Labour, Number due to.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *Aug. 4*, 1022, 1023.

Trades, Mines, etc.—Decrease in number of accidents, alleged.
O. Mr. J. Burns, *Aug. 4*, 1022.

Acheen

Dutch War with, British Government representations as to cessation of hostilities and reference of dispute to Hague Peace Tribunal, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 961, 962.

Acland-Hood, Captain Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury* [Somersetshire, Wellington]

Bills on the Order Paper, Date of Statement as to, *July 29*, 160.

Russo-Japanese War — British vessels, detention and search of, by Russian Warships, *July 29*, 160.

Shop Hours Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 5*, 1272.

Accounts, Public
Committee Report.
Criticisms on—Breaches of Regulations and unconstitutional practices.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1677–1680; Mr. McKenna, 1680, 1681; Mr. Brodrick, 1681, 1682; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1682, 1683; Mr. S Buxton, 1683, 1684; Mr. Whitley, 1686; Mr. J. H. Lewis, 1687, 1688.
Discussion, opportunity for.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Lloyd-George; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 283.

Adjournment of the House
Motions under Standing Order No. 10, Return as to, ordered, *Aug. 2*, 510; Presented, *Aug.* 3 707.

Admiralty
First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Financial Secretary—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.
Vote, Date of taking.
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug, 8*, 1377.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs
Commission of Inquiry on Arsenical Poisoning—Appointment of expert officer to deal with questions as to purity of manufactured foods.
Q. Mr. Round; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 712.

Africa, Central
Congo, *see that title.*
Niger and Lake Chad Boundary Commission, Work of, cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 9*, 1557.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 9*, 1558.

Africa, South
Banks, British, in—Claims as to gold commandeered by late South African Republic, Inquiry into, arbitration, etc., proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 521.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 998, 999.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1375.
Chartered Company of South Africa, *see that title.*
Financial Position of—Date of repayments to Great Britain, etc.
References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 35, 38, 39.
Garrison in.
Buildings, expenditure on—Information as to.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1677, 1678; Mr. B. Davenport, 1686.

Africa, South—*cont.*
Garrison in—*cont.*
Cost.
Colonial Contributions, etc.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 29*, 89.
Comparison with Esquimalt and Halifax, N.S.
Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1346.
Reduction in strength of, proposed.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1405; Capt. Norton, 1445, 1446.
Railways taken over by the Military during the War—Price paid, authority responsible, etc.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Aug. 9*, 1682; Mr. S. Buxton, 1684; Mr. B. Davenport, 1685.
Shipping Freights Conference—Date of Meeting, terms of reference, and method of procedure.
Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 8*, 1350.
Simon's Bay, Naval Works at, expenditure on, etc.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1522; Earl of Selborne, 1535.
Stores, Military, Illegal disposal of, by Colonel Morgan, alleged—War Office Inquiry, proposed.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1679; Mr. McKenna, 1680.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 2*, 523.
Transvaal *and* Orange River Colony, *see those titles.*
War, *see* South African War.

Africa, West
Lagos, wild animals and birds in, protection of—Restrictions on sale of guns and powder, etc., to the Natives.
Q. Sir H. Seton-Karr; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 8*, 1347.

Agriculture, Board of
President—Earl of Onslow.

Agriculture
Depression in—Number of Acres in England and Wales gone out of Cultivation since 1874, rateable value of rural Districts in 1873 and 1903, etc.
Q. Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *Aug. 9*, 1563.
Products, Exportation of, from Foreign Countries—Return showing total value of, presented *Aug. 5*, 1211.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
President—Mr. G. Wyndham.
Libraries, Village, Information as to literature supplied to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1361.

[*cont.*

Agriculture, etc.,—*cont.*
Veterinary Branch.
Clerks, reply to Memorial from.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 995.
Promotions, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1366.
Salaries of Transferred Clerks.
Q Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1367.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. (Argyll)
Salmon and Sea Trout Fisheries, Scotland, Protection of—Notice issued by Fishmongers' Company, *Aug. 8*, 1340.
Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug. 2*, 666.

Alcoholic Beverages
Production and Consumption of, in European Countries, United States, and British Colonies—Memorandum and Statistical Tables ordered, *Aug. 3*, 707.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill
l. Commons' Amendts, *Con.* Aug. 1* 161.

Aliens Bill
Abandonment of.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 2*, 548; Sir C. Dilke, 551; Mr. S. Buxton, 566; Mr. W. Churchill, 571; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 581.

America
See United States of America.

Ancient Monuments, Ireland
Ardandra Castle, preservation of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 4*, 961.

Anderson, Constable
See under Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Anglo-French Agreement
See France — Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain.

Animals
Experiments on—Increase in Vivisection experiments.
Q. Mr. Tomkinson; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 517.

Ankylostomia
Infection, Prevention of—Recommendations in Report of Dr. Boycott, etc.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 518, 519.
Humane slaughtering, Committee Report on—Measures for adoption of Recommendations.
Qs. Dr. Farquharson; *As.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 528, 529.

Anson, Sir W. R.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Oxford University]
Cookery, hygiene and domestic economy, instruction in, Physical Deterioriation Committee's recommendation as to, *Aug. 4*, 985.
Elementary Education — Cost and Percentage borne by local and Imperial funds from 1899–1902, *Aug. 4*, 960.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com., Aug. 5*, 1238–1240, 1243.
Hatfield—Inclusion of rooms for technical instruction in new school, powers of local authority, etc., *July 29*, 85.
Religious Instruction.
Denominational teaching, Deduction from teachers' salaries for time spent in—West Riding of Yorkshire County Council's Resolution *Aug. 8*, 1338.
Parents, right of, to nominate instructor, *Aug. 8*, 1339.
Schools.
Carnarvonshire National Schools—Variations sanctioned as to foundation managers, *Aug. 9*, 1553.
Hatfield, inclusion of rooms for technical instruction in new schools, Powers of local authority, etc., *July, 29*, 85.
Teachers.
Agreement, application of Article 15 of Code of 1904, *Aug. 3*, 713.
Salaries—Denominational teaching, deduction for time spent in—West Riding of Yorkshire County Council's Resolution, *Aug. 8*, 1338.
Wales—Carnarvonshire National Schools—Variations sanctioned as to foundation managers, *Aug. 9*, 1553.

Anthrax
Increase of, among workers in Horse-hair industry.
O. Sir Charles Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1008; Mr. Tennant, 1013; Mr Asquith, 1028.
Liverpool—Death of a man from anthrax —Precaution to prevent spread of disease proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Macdona; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 260.

Antrim
Shaftesbury, Earl of, Sale of estates of—price asked, etc.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1365.

Arbroath Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Ardagh

Burial ground, new, Loan for completion of—Decision of Local Government Board.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 277.

Ardandra Castle, Ireland

Preservation of, as ancient monument, proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 4*, 961.

Armagh

Flags displayed on Licensed Premises, Action of Constabulary in prohibiting, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 715.

Poor Law Officials.

Assistant Teacher and Catechist, Abolition of office of, Pension granted to Miss M'Kee, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 5*, 1218.

Religious Denominations of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 5*, 1217, 1218.

Army

Secretary of State—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Under Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.
Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Bromley Davenport.

Adjutant-General, Duties of.
O. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1406.

Africa, South, Garrison in, *see under* Africa, South.

Ammunition, Reserve of, Standard of—Amount brought back from South Africa, etc.
O. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1679, 1680.

Appropriation Accounts referred to Committee. *Aug. 8*, 1488.

Army Corps System, Abandonment of.
O. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 8*, 1411.

Artillery, Re-armament of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 8*, 1431; Mr. C. Warner, 1470.
Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1348, 1349.

Auxiliary Forces.
(*see also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry)

Home Defence dependent on.
O. Mr. Llewellyn, *Aug. 8*, 1423, 1424.

Representative at the War Office, Appointment of, proposed.
O. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1406.

Barracks, Improvement in.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1393.

Army—*cont.*

Camps.

Colchester—Allocation of Straw Contracts, etc.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 3*, 716.

Curragh Camp Building Contract—Employment of Unskilled Labour, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1368.

Litter for Horses—Experiments with Peat Moss, Allocation of Contracts for Straw, etc.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 3*, 716.

Cardwell Scheme, Reverting to, proposed.
O. Mr. Guest, *Aug.* 8, 1461.

Changes effected in, during the last ten years.
O. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 8*, 1409, 1410.

Colonial and Foreign Regiments, Reduction in Number of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1394; Lord G. Hamilton, 1398; Sir C. Dilke, 1428.

Compulsory Military Service, *see that title.*

Defence of the Empire, *see that title.*

Dual Army, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 8*, 1413, 1414; Col. Sandys, 1458; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1462.

Egypt, Increased Contributions from, proposed.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1404; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1466.

Expenditure.

Increase in.

References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 29, 33, 37.

Automatic, Ultimate total of.
Qs. Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 256, 265.

Reduction in, Proposals as to.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 2*, 615.

Finance, Recommendations of Public Accounts Committee and War Office Reconstitution Committee.
Q. Major Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 9*, 1556, 1557.

Foreign Service, Recruiting for, Inducements to be offered, etc.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 8*, 1414; Capt. Norton, 1444.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Guards, Reduction in Strength of, proposed.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1403; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1465.

Home Army, Reduction in Strength of, Necessity for.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1385, 1393; Sir C. Rasch, 1407; Sir L. Knowles, 1437–1439, 1441; Mr. Guest, 1460.

Home Service Battalions.

Strength of.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 8*, 1453, 1454.

Thirty-three Battalions, Scheme for Creation of.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Aug. 8*, 1397; Mr. W. Churchill, 1410.

Horses.

Litter for—Experiments with Peat Moss, Allocation of Contracts for Straw, etc.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 3*, 716.

Remounts.

Disposal of, Prices obtained, etc.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1679; Mr. Brodrick, 1681, 1682; Mr. B. Davenport, 1686.

Ireland—Number purchased in 1903.
Qs. Mr. Ffrench, Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1368, 1369.

Indian, *see under* India.

Infantry—Reorganisation proposals.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1393, 1394; Sir L. Knowles, 1437–1439.

Inspector-General of the Forces, Duties of.
O. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1407.

Kilbride Canteen Licence, Irregularity in signing, by Magistrate—Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 278, 279.

Knox, Sir C., and other Officers—Payment of Salaries to, after disallowance by the Treasury.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1678; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1683; Mr. S. Buxton, 1683, 1684; Mr. Brodrick, 1684; Mr. B. Davenport, 1684, 1685; Mr. Whitley, 1686.

Lanarkshire Fusiliers, 1st Battalion—Mediterranean Service, Prolongation of, alleged.
Q. Sir Lees Knowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 29*, 88.

Army—*cont.*

Linked Battalions System, Abandonment of.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 8*, 1412, 1413; Sir L. Knowles, 1441; Colonel Sandys, 1458.

Master-General of Ordnance, Duties of.
O. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1406.

Militia, Volunteers and Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Naval Fortresses, Defence of—Entrusting to the Marines, proposed.
Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *Aug. 8*, 1399, 1400; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1464.

Officers—Return of Officers permitted to hold civil employment of profit under Public Departments, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1332.

Quarter-Master-General, Duties of.
O. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1406.

Recruiting.

Foreign Service, Inducements to Recruits for.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, Aug. *8*, 1414; Captain Norton, 1444.

Inducements to be offered, Betterment of Terms of Service, etc.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1393, 1463, 1465; Lord G. Hamilton, 1401; Sir A. Hayter, 1403; Captain Norton, 1444; Colonel Sandys, 1457, 1458.

Maghera, Ireland, Exhibition of Disloyal Notices in.
Q. Mr. Gordon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1367.

Number of Recruits required, and Method of Obtaining, etc.
Os. Captain Norton, *Aug 8*, 1444; Colonel Sandys, 1457, 1458; Mr. Guest, 1460; Mr. Arnold Forster, 1463; Mr. C. Warner, 1469.

Reform Proposals, Date of Commencement under.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 265.

Reductions in, and Additions to, under Reform Proposals.

Exemption of certain Battalions from, proposed.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 3*, 716, 717.

Financial Effect of.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1383, 1384; Mr. W. Churchill, 1410, 1411; Sir C. Dilke, 1427; Captain Norton, 1442, 1443; Mr. Guest, 1459.

Statement Presented, *Aug. 2*, 395, 508.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Reductions—*cont.*
Home Army, Necessity for Reductions in.
Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1385, 1393; Sir C. Rasch, 1407; Sir L. Knowles, 1437–1440; Mr. Guest, 1460.
Reform Proposals.
Decision as to, Method proposed to arrive at, Opportunity for discussion, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 254;
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 538, 539.
Finance Department, Constitution of.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 29*, 88.
Financial Effect of—Statement Presented, *Aug. 2*, 395, 508.
Papers Presented to the House.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1383.
Particulars of, Presented, *Aug. 1*, 252; *Aug. 2*, 395.
Responsibility of the House for.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 8*, 1426, 1427; Mr. Asquith, 1432; Sir J. Fergusson, 1433, 1435; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 1450, 1451; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1468, 1469.
Roberts, Earl, Views of.
Qs. Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *Aug. 1*, 256, 266,
Statement (Mr. Arnold-Forster) *Aug. 8*, 1380–1396.
Date on which copies will be available for Members.
Q. Sir A. Hayter; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 4*, 974.
War Department Orders in Council, Procedure as to.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 264.
Reserve.
Changes in, Objections to.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1402, 1403; Mr. C. Hobhouse. 1453, 1454; Mr. Guest, 1460.
Regulations, Further, Relating to, Presented, *Aug. 4*, 839, 953.
Rifle Ranges, *see that title.*
Rosshire Regiments, Depôt of, under Reform Proposals.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 264.
Soldiers, Summer Head-gear for, Issue of.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1349, 1350.

Army—*cont.*
Strength of, at Home and Abroad.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1394.
Territorial Regiments, Proposed Establishment of.
O. Sir L. Knowles, *Aug. 8*, 1440, 1441.
Three Years System, Extensions under, Number of, in 1904.
Q. Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 4*, 958.
War Department Orders in Council, Procedure as to, under Reform Proposals.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 264.
War Office, *see that title.*
Works, Expenditure on, Alleged Waste, etc.
O. Mr. M. Ferguson, *Aug. 3*, 822.

Army Council.
Responsibility of, for Militia Reform Proposals — Interdependence of Council and Cabinet, etc.
Os. Earl Spencer, Earl of Donoughmore, *July 29*, 50; Lord Burghclere, 63

Army Council Bill.
l. 2R. *July 29*, 71.
Com. Aug.4, 840.
Rep.* *Aug. 4*, 843.
3R. *Aug. 5*, 1208.
c. 1R.* *Aug. 8*, 1379.
Debates on Second Reading (Lords), *July 29*, 71; *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 840; *Third Reading*, *Aug. 5*, 1208.
Military Members of Council, duration of Appointments of, 72, 74, 840, 841.
Parliamentary Members, number of, 72–74, 843, 1208, 1209.
Relative position of Secretary of State, and Members of the Council, definition of, 72, 73.
Statutory Powers of Secretary of State, Transfer of, to the Council, proposed, 71, 72, 841–843, 1208.

Army Estimates
Civil Superannuation; Compensation; Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities—£189,000, *Com.* * *Aug. 9*, 1666.
Clothing Establishments and Services—£1,156,000, *Com.* * *Aug. 9*, 1665.
Imperial Yeomanry, Pay and Allowances—£468,000, *Com.* * *Aug. 9*, 1665.
Increase, Automatic; Ultimate Total of.
Qs. Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 256, 265.
Medical Establishment, Pay, &c. —£484,000, *Com.* * *Aug. 9*, 1665.
Military Education, Establishments for—£146,000, *Com.* * *Aug. 9*, 1666.
[*cont.*

Army Estimates—*cont.*

- Militia: Pay, Bounty, etc.—£817,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1665.
- Miscellaneous Effective Services—£73,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1666.
- Non-effective Charges for Men, etc.—£1,676,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1666.
- Non-effective Charges for Officers, etc.—£1,666,000, *Com.*Aug. 9*, 1666.
- Ordnance Factories—£70,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1666.
- Provisions, Forage, etc. — £4,582,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1665.
- Savings and Deficiencies on Grants, etc.—Committee to consider, *Aug. 8*, 1488.
- Surpluses on certain Votes, Application of, to cover Deficiencies on other Votes—Resolution in Committee of Supply, *Aug. 9*, 1675, 1676.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1677; Mr. J. H. Lewis, 1687, 1688.
- Transports and Remounts — £1,519,000 *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1665.
- Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances—£1,220,000, *Com.*, Aug. 9*, 1665.
- War Office, Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges—£331,000, *Com. Aug. 8*, 1380.
- Works, Buildings and Repairs, Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services—£1,918,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1666.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*Secretary of State for War* [Belfast, W.]

- Africa, South.
  - Garrison in—Cost.
    - Colonial Contribution, etc., *July 29*, 89.
    - Cost per head, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1346.
  - Stores, Military, Illegal disposal of, by Colonel Morgan, alleged —Investigation by War Office, etc., *Aug. 2*, 523.
- Artillery—Re-armament Proposals—Number of Orders placed, *Aug. 8*, 1349.
- Barracks, Improvement in, *Aug. 8*, 1393.
- Camps.
  - Colchester—Allocation of Straw Contracts, *Aug. 3*, 716.
  - Curragh Camp Building Contract—Employment of Unskilled Labour, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1368.
  - Litter for Horses—Experiments with Peat Moss, etc., *Aug. 3*, 716.
- Canada, British Troops in—Number, Cost, Canadian Contribution, etc., *July 29*, 89.
- Colonial Regiments, Reduction in Number of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1394.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*

- Compulsory Service — Cost of Training, *Aug. 2*, 523.
- Council—Secretary of State for War—Nature of Powers and Duties proposed to be transferred to Army Council, *July 29*, 90.
- Dual Army, Proposals as to, *Aug. 8*, 1462.
- Egypt, Garrison in, Contributions towards, *Aug. 8*, 1466.
- Estimates—Automatic Increase, Ultimate Total of, *Aug. 1*, 256, 265.
- Finance —Recommendations of Public Accounts Committee and War Office Reconstitution Committee, *Aug. 9*, 1557.
- Guards, Reduction in strength of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1465.
- Home Army, Strength of, necessity for reduction in, *Aug. 8*, 1385, 1393.
- Horses.
  - Ireland, number of remounts purchased in, during 1903, *Aug. 8*, 1369.
  - Litter for—Experiments with peat moss, &c., *Aug. 3*, 716.
- Indian Army—Effect of Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1395, 1461, 1462.
- Infantry, Changes in, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1393, 1394.
- Lancashire Fusiliers, 1st Battalion—Mediterranean Service, Prolongation of, alleged, *July 29*, 88.
- Militia.
  - Embodying, for six months in the year, with six weeks additional training, *Aug. 8*, 1389, 1391.
  - Line, number passing into, from the Militia, *Aug. 8*, 1389, 1390.
  - Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1388–1392, 1466, 1467.
  - South African War, number serving in, number granted honorary Army rank, &c., *Aug. 8*, 1350.
  - Swiss System, *Aug. 8*, 1467.
  - Terms of enlistment—Two years' service in the battalion, and six years' in the Reserve, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1391.
  - Territorial Battalions, formation of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1390-1392.
- Naval Fortresses, defence of—Entrusting to the Marines, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1464.
- Recruiting.
  - Date of commencement of, under Reform Proposals, *Aug. 1*, 265.
  - Inducements to be offered, betterment of terms of Service, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1393, 1463.

[*cont.*

Arnold-Foster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*

Reductions in, under Reform Proposals.

Exemption of certain battalions from, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 717.

Financial effect of, *Aug. 8*, 1383, 1384.

Reform Proposals.

Finance Department, Constitution of, *July 29*, 88.

Papers presented to the House, *Aug. 8*, 1383.

Responsibility of the House for, *Aug. 8*, 1468, 1469.

Roberts, Earl, views of, as to, *Aug. 1*, 256, 266.

Statement, *Aug. 8*, 1380–1396.

Date on which copies will be available for Members, *Aug. 4* 974.

War Department Orders in Council, procedure as to, *Aug. 1*, 264.

Rifle Range at Porthcawl, expenditure on date of completion, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1349

Ross-shire Regiments, Depôt of, under Reform Proposals, *Aug. 1*, 264.

Soldiers, Summer headgear for, issue of, *Aug*, *8*, 1350.

South African War.

Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteers serving in—number granted honorary Army rank, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1350.

Trophies—Allotment of Guns, *Aug. 8*, 1345.

Strength of the Army at Home and Abroad, *Aug. 8*, 1394.

Three years system, Extension under, in 1904, numbers of, *Aug. 4*, 958.

Volunteers.

Cost per head per annum, and items upon which reductions are proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1345.

Division of, into two classes, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1387.

Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1386.

South African War, number serving in, number granted honorary Army rank, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1350.

Yeomanry.

Expenditure on, *Aug. 8*, 1466.

South African War, number serving in, number granted honorary Army rank, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1350.

War Department Orders in Council, procedure as to, under Reform Proposals, *Aug. 1*, 264.

War, Secretary of State for—Powers and duties proposed to be transferred to Army Council, *July 29*, 90.

Arran, Earl of

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1114.

Ashbourne, Lord

National School Teachers—Assistants, Average School attendance required for appointment of, provision for reduction in, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1326, 1327,

Workhouse Inspectors, Ireland—Female Inspectors, appointment of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1327, 1328.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]

Army Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1432.

Education [Local Authority Default] Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1268.

Factories and Workshops, Inspection of, laxity in carrying out—inadequate number of Inspectors, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1026.

Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 379–388.

Liberal Unionist Association, Action of Ministers in joining, etc., *Aug. 1*, 381–383.

Licensing Bill 3R., *July 29*, 90, 100.

Shop Hours Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 5*, 1270.

Assam

Cherra, Siemship of—Procedure in filling Vacancy.

Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 4*, 967.

Dibrugarh, Excessive sentence on native at, alleged

Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 9*, 1556.

Assizes

Summer, Cork, Jury Challenging at, Reason for, etc.

Qs. Mr. Flynn, Capt. Donelan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Aug. 2*, 529, 530.

Athenry

Graig Abbey—Purchase of grazing land for enlarging uneconomic holdings, proposed.

Q. Mr. Roche; *A*, Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 995.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N. W.]

Sievier *v* Duke—Inspector called to give evidence as to character of the plaintiff—objections to practice, *Aug. 4*, 1049, 1050.

Athlone

Bog in parish of St. John's, purchase of, by Congested Districts Board—Turbary rights of former tenants, etc.

Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1342, 1343.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]

Blake, late Mrs. Helen, Estate of—Effort made to trace heirs, etc., *Aug. 4*, 996

Cork Summer Assizes, Reason for Jury challenging at, *Aug. 2*, 529, 530.

[*cont.*

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Edgeworthstown Loan Fund Society Frauds, Government Action as to, *Aug. 4*, 997.

Attorney-General—*Sir Robert Finlay.*

Attorney-General for Ireland—*Mr. J. Atkinson.*

Australia
- Mails to—Contract with Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, for conveyance of—Copy ordered, *Aug. 4*, 954.

Austria
- Balkans, Countries South of, Agreement concerning.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 978.

Ayr Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
- *l.* 1R.*, *July 29*, 2.
- 2R.*, and *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1086.
- 3R.*, *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
- Mall to Charing Cross—South African War Memorial, Erection of, at Eastern End, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 714.
- Parliament.
  - House of Commons.
    - Post and Telegraph Office in Members' Lobby.
      - Defective Ventilation of, alleged, *Aug. 4*, 964.
      - Enlargement of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1564.
    - Ventilation, Improvement of.
      - Inlet fan, particulars as to, *Aug. 4*, 985.
      - Plant, Names of Firms tendering for Supply of, *July 29*, 85.
    - Watts, Painting by, in Grand Committee Room—Condition of Picture—Removal to more Appropriate place, etc., *Aug. 4*, 964.
- South African War Memorial, Erection of, at Eastern End of Mall Extension, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 714.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
- Accounts, Public—Opportunity for discussing Committee's Report, *Aug. 1*, 283.
- Africa, South—British Banks, Claims of, as to gold commandeered by late South African Republic, Committee to consider, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 521; *Aug. 4*, 998, 999; *Aug. 8*, 1375.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
- Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 581.
- Army Reform Proposals, Decision as to, Method proposed to arrive at—opportunity for discussion, etc., *Aug. 1*, 254; *Aug 2*, 538, 539.
- Business of the House.
  - Bills still remaining to be passed, *Aug. 2*, 542–547.
  - Conduct of, Criticism on, *Aug. 2*, 578, 579.
  - Course of, *Aug. 3*, 734, 735; *Aug. 4*, 1001, 1002; *Aug. 8*, 1377, 1378; *Aug. 9*, 1567, 1690.
  - Private Members' Rights, non-interference with, during present Session, *Aug. 2*, 542.
  - Supply Business, conduct of, *Aug. 2*, 579, 581.
  - Twelve O'clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of Session, *Aug. 2*, 542.
    - Fridays, exemption of, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 587.
- Capital Expenditure (Money) Resolution—Objections to taking, after twelve o'clock, *Aug. 2*, 651, 656, 657.
- Charities
  - St. Katherine's Hospital, Regent's Park,—Administration of endowment, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1000.
  - Whitstable Scheme, Provisions of—Local Opposition, etc., *Aug. 2*, 540.
- Coal, Export of Smokeless Steam, Government control of, *Aug. 8*, 1376.
- Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, Date of proceeding with, *Aug. 2*, 539, 544.
- County Courts Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 580.
- Cunard Agreement, Facilities for discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 675, 676, 678, 682; *Aug. 3*, 830, 831.
- Defence of the Empire.
  - Committee of Defence.
    - Executive powers and authority of, *Aug. 2*, 618, 619.
    - Functions of, *Aug. 2*, 618, 619.
    - Staff,
      - Expenses of, etc., *Aug. 2*, 602.
      - German General Staff as a model, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 618.
      - Secretary, information as to salary of, *Aug. 2*, 640.
    - Work of, value of, *Aug, 2*, 617, 622.
  - Discussion of, as a whole, importance of, *Aug. 2*, 603.
  - Home Defence, Committee Report as to, *Aug. 2*, 620

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Ecclesiastical Disorders, Date of presenting Committee Report on, *Aug. 1*, 281.
- Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com. Aug. 5*, 1224.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 546
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R., *Aug. 4*, 1082; *Com. Aug 9*, 1693, 1694.
- Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 366–379.
  - Conference with Colonies, etc., proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1375.
- India—North-west Frontier, defence of, *Aug. 2*, 620, 621.
- Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R, *Aug. 5*, 1278, 1280.
- Judge-Advocate-General—Name of present holder of office—Restoration of office to former position as Parliamentary office, etc., *Aug. 2*, 539.
- Judges—King's Bench Division—Appointment of additional Judges, proposed, *July 29*, 81.
- Liberal Unionist Association, Action of Ministers in joining, etc., *Aug. 1*, 366–370.
- Licensing Bill, 3R, *July 29*, 134, 147–149.
- Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill, proceeding with, this session, *Aug. 1*, 281, 282
- Musical Copyright Bill, Providing facilities for passing into law, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 579.
- National Portrait Gallery, Proposals as to enlargement of, *Aug. 4*, 975.
- Navy.
  - Expenditure — Statement, delay in presenting, *Aug. 8*, 1376.
  - Flogging in — Abolition proposed, *Aug. 4*, 999.
- Parliamentary Procedure — New Rules, Failure of, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 578.
  - Small Government Bills, Absence of Machinery to ensure passing of, *Aug. 2*, 581, 582.
- Port of London Bill.
  - Abandonment of, *Aug 2*, 580.
  - Carrying over, to next session, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1348, 1374.
- Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1275, 1276.
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug. 1*, 283.
- Revenue and Expenditure, Committee Report on, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug. 1*, 282.
- Rhodesia—Chartered Company of South Africa, Delegates sent to discuss with, as to terms of cancelling Charter, etc. Obtaining Parliamentary approval of terms, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 254.
- Ritualistic Practices, Date of presenting Committee Report on, *Aug. 1*, 281.
- Russo-Japanese War.
  - British Vessels, Detention and search of, by Russian Warships.
    - Inquiry and Protest by British Government, *Aug. 8*, 1371, 1373, 1374.
    - "Knight Commander," Sinking of, Inquiry as to, *Aug. 2*, 538; *Aug. 8*, 1373, 1374.
    - "Malacca," Inquiry as to, *Aug. 8*, 1371–1373.
- St. Katherine's Hospital, Regent's Park—Administration of Endowment, *Aug. 4*, 1000.
- Scotland.
  - Estimates, date of taking — Opportunity for discussion, *Aug. 1*, 283.
  - Free Church *v.* Lord Overtoun, House of Lords' judgment in case of—Statement as to proposed legislative action, etc., *Aug 3*, 734.
  - National Gallery, date of taking Vote for, *July 29*, 81.
- Shop Hours Bill.
  - Date of taking, *Aug. 4*, 1001, 1002. *Con. Aug. 5*, 1270.
- Telegraph Vote, date of taking, *Aug. 8*, 1375.
- Thames Barrage Scheme, inquiry as to practicability of, proposed, *July 29*, 81.
- Trades Disputes, Committee on, Information as to proceedings of, *Aug. 2*, 521; *Aug. 8*, 1348.
- Trades Unions Funds, Protection of—Introduction of Legislation next Session, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1348.
- Transvaal — Representative Government, Proposals as to.
  - Discussion, Opportunity for, etc., *Aug. 2*, 524–527.
  - Procedure, Precedent for, *Aug. 4*, 1000, 1001.
- Whitstable Charities Scheme, Provisions of—Local Opposition, etc., *Aug. 2*, 540.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]

- Coal Exports—Japan and Russia, Amount exported to, during 1904, *Aug. 8*, 1357.
- Cunard Agreement, Facilities for adequate discussion of, *Aug. 3*, 836.
- Electric Lighting Provisional Orders, number of, granted from 1898–1903, time for completion, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1337.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Right Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
Fiscal Policy—Free Trade *v.* Protection.
Blue-book, revised edition of, proposed, *Aug, 4*, 957.
Retaliation and preferential tariff proposals—Returns proposed showing probable effect on trade of the United Kingdom, *Aug. 4*, 984.
Imports of manufactured and partly manufactured articles, Return as to, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1554.
Irish lace, counterfeit, sale of, in Nice, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1368.
Merchant Shipping.
Foreign vessels plying to and from British ports—number, life-saving appliances carried, *Aug. 3*, 713; *Aug. 8*, 1356.
Seamen—Engagements during June and July—proportion of British to foreign sailors and firemen, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1334, 1335.
Squadrons of warships, Board of Trade circulars as to danger in approaching, *Aug. 5*, 1215.
Non-employment in skilled and unskilled trades of principal industrial countries, statistics as to, *Aug. 2*, 517.
Piers and Harbours—Ireland—Fenit Harbour Board, Inquiry into, proposed, *Aug 8*, 1356.
Railways.
Inspectors—Additional sub-Inspector, Appointment of, *Aug. 4*, 964.
Ireland—Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway, overcrowding on, alleged, *Aug. 4*, 973.
Metropolitan and Metropolitan District—delay in introducing electric traction, alleged, *July 29*, 84.
Scotland — Workmen's trains from Glasgow, improvement of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1356.
Servants, Hours of, in October, 1903—Date of presenting Return, *Aug. 2*, 517.
Wheat, Imported—Price, Duty, etc., in United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Italy in June and July, 1904, *July 29*, 84; *Aug. 8*, 1337.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Bradford Corporation Act, 1903—Irregularity in Report on Costs, Agreement of parties to compromise, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1284.
Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill—Suspension of Standing Orders, *Aug. 2*, 394; *Aug. 8*, 1282.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1133, 1201, 1207; 3R., *Aug. 9*, 1507–1514, 1517, 1518.
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill—Suspension of Standing Order, *Aug. 9*, 1495.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord—*cont.*
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1090.
Standing Orders—Alterations in, rendered necessary by transference of a Department from Board of Trade to Board of Agriculture, *Aug. 9*, 1489–1495.

Balkans
Agreement by Russia and Austria as to countries south of.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 973.

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway
Guarantee, Conditions of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 8*, 1333, 1334.
Overcrowding on, alleged.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *Aug. 4*, 973.

Ballymacrossin
Fox, Maj., Sale of Estate of—Reinstatement of Miss Masterson, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Burke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 991, 992.

Ballymoney, Ireland
Post Office business, information as to.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 964, 965.

Ballynahinch
Liquor traffic, Illegal, alleged, in.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 263, 264.
River, Illegal netting in—Rights of Belfast Anglers' Association, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 989.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]
Bills on the Order Paper, Date of Statement as to, *July 29*, 160.
Russo-Japanese War — British Vessels, detention and search of, by Russian Warships. *July 29*, 160.
Shop Hours Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 5*, 1269.

Bangor, Ireland.
Harbour, estimate for, Amount to be contributed by the Department of Agriculture, etc.
Q. Mr. T. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 985, 986.
Post Office Business, Amount of, Increase of Accommodation, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 964, 965; *Q.* Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 996.

Bankruptcy
Board of Trade General Annual Report, presented, *Aug. 4*, 840, 954.

Banks

Ireland.

Bank of — Government Accounts, Arrangements for keeping.

Qs. Capt. Donelan; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug.* *4*, 979, 980.

Provincial Bank of — Government Accounts, Arrangements for keeping — Assimilating with Scotch and English systems, proposed.

Qs. Capt. Donelan; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug.* *4*, 979, 980.

Bann River

Drainage of—Report presented, *Aug.* *1*, 163, 253.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill

. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 29*, 77.

Barran, Mr. R. H. [Leeds, N.]

Leeds Telegraph Service—Filling Vacancy in Superintendents' Survey Branch, *Aug.* *2*, 515.

Barrow River

Drainage of—Government Assistance in Schemes, etc.

Qs. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug.* *2*, 535, 536.

Barry Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill

c. *Con.** *Aug.* *4*, 951.

3R.* *Aug.* *8*, 1329.

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.***Aug.* *8*, 1281.

Bath, Marquess of

Licensing Bill, 2R., *Aug.* *1*,197-201; *Com.* *Aug.* *5*, 1151.

Bath and Wells, Lord Bishop of

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug.* *4*, 894-897.

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. [Bristol, W.]

Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug.* *3*, 811, 812, 814.

Beauchamp, Earl

Army and Navy, Increased Expenditure on, *July 29*, 33, 34.

Finance Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 32; 3R. *July 29*, 42.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug.* *4*, 946; *Aug.* *5*, 1115, 1122-1124, 1134, 1146, 1150, 1151, 1189.

Savings Bank, Post Office—Deposits, Particulars as to Investment of, *Aug.* *5*, 1096.

Sugar Convention, Working of, *July 29*, 36.

Tea, Additional 2d. per Pound on, *July 29*, 34.

Tobacco Duties — Anticipations of the Budget, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 29*, 32, 33.

Beck, Adolf

Mistaken Identity Case—Reparation for Wrongful Imprisonment, etc.

Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug.* *3*, 719, 720.

Belfast

Post Office, *see under* Post Office—Ireland.

Queen's College—Annual Report of President, Presented, *Aug.* *8*, 1285, 1331.

Telegraph Service—Messengers, Rate of Pay of.

Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* *3*, 733.

Belfast and North-East Ireland Electricity and Power Gas Bill

c. Rep.* *Aug.* *3*, 706.

3R.* *Aug.* *8*, 1329.

l. Commons' Amendments *Con.** *Aug.* *8*, 1281.

Belfast Corporation Tramways Bill

c. Rep.* *Aug.* *3*, 706.

3R.* *Aug.* *8*, 1329.

l. Commons' Amendments *con.** *Aug.* *8*, 1281.

Belfast Lough

Trawling in, Illegal, alleged.

Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* *3*, 720, 721.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]

Fiscal Policy of the Country, Proposed Changes in, *Aug.* *1*, 348.

Railways.

Inspectors—Additional Sub-Inspector, Appointment of, *Aug.* *4*, 964

Servants, Hours of, in October 1903—Date of Presenting Return, *Aug.* *2*, 517.

Trades Disputes, Committee on, Information as to Proceedings of, *Aug.* *2*, 521; *Aug.* *8*, 1348.

Trades Unions Funds, Protection of—Introduction of Legislation next Session, proposed, *Aug.* *8*, 1348.

Belleville Boilers

see under Navy—Boilers.

Bellew, Lord

Representative Peer for Ireland, Election as—Writs, Returns and Certificates Presented, *Aug.* *2*, 393.

Took the Oath, *Aug.* *4*, 837.

Belper, Lord

Licensing Bill.

2R. *Aug.* *1*, 164-175, 180, 248.

Com., *Aug.* *4*, 851-854, 867, 868, 871, 872, 927; *Aug.* *5*, 1115, 1116, 1135, 1138, 1141, 1142, 1168, 1169, 1180, 1181, 1189.

Rep. *Aug.* *8*, 1290, 1307, 1319, 1322.

3R. *Aug.* *9*, 1504-1507.

Benn, Mr. J. W. [Devonport]
Devonport Dockyard.
Petitions from Workers, Delay in Replying to, alleged, *July 29*, 87.
Wages for Unskilled Labour, Increase in, proposed, *July 29*, 87.

Bennett Estate
Fair Rent Appeal of J. Dooley—Supply of Copy of Report of Court Assessor.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 534, 535.

Beresford Estate
Sale of, Proceedings as to.
Qs. Mr. Power; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4* 988, 989.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Transvaal, Trading Rights of British Indian Subjects in, *Aug. 9*, 1559.

Bills
Committee Stage—Withdrawal of Clause, Powers of Committee to Refuse Leave for.
Qs. Duke of Northumberland, *Aug. 5*, 1086, 1090, 1092; Earl of Kintore, 1088; Lord Glenesk, 1090; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 1090; Lord Kenyon, 1093; Earl Cawdor, 1093.
Hybrid—Number Introduced in Session 1904, etc.—Return Ordered, *Aug. 2*, 512, 513; Presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.
Initiation of Bills of Public Interest in the Lords, proposed.
Qs. Earl of Halsbury, *July 29*, 8; Lord James of Hereford, 10.
Local.
Deeds, Documents, or Allegations mentioned or set forth in, Admission of Affidavits in proof of—Standing Order relating to, *Aug. 9*, 1493, 1494.
Deposit of Copies of—Standing Order relating to, *Aug. 9*, 1491, 1492.
Number not Introduced, and Number Abandoned.
Qs. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 2*, 548, 549; Sir C. Dilke, 551, 552; Mr. Lloyd-George, 561, 562.
Number still Remaining to be Disposed of.
Qs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 542–547; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 548, 549.
Private.
Commons' Amendments, Copies of to be deposited in Private Bill Office, *Aug. 5*, 1210.
Lords' Amendments, Order for Consideration of, *Aug. 5*, 1210.
Number Introduced in Session 1904, etc.—Return Ordered, *Aug. 2*, 512, 513; Presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.

Bills—*cont.*
Standing Orders 220 and 246 Suspended for remainder of Session, *Aug. 5*, 1210.
Public, Number of, Introduced and Passed by Lords and Commons in Session 1904—Return as to, Ordered, *Aug. 2*, 511; Presented, 707.
Small Government Bills, Absence of Machinery to ensure Passing of, *Aug. 2*, 581, 582.
Statement as to, Date of.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Sir A. Acland-Hood, *July 29*, 160.

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 9*, 1706.

Births
Ireland—Report of Registrar-General for 1903, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Bishopric of Bristol Bill
c. Order for Committee read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1486.

"Blake," H.M.S.
Accident on—Recognition of Heroism of Chief Stoker Gee.
Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 2*, 513, 514.

Blake, Mr. E.—*Temporary Chairman of Committees* [Longford, S.]
Irish Development Grant, Date of Taking, *Aug. 8*, 1377.
Irish Land Bill, Proposals as to, *Aug. 9*, 1567.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill 2R. *Aug. 5*, 1279.
King-Harman Estate, Sale of—Reinstatement of P. Fox, Evicted Tenant, *Aug. 3*, 723.

Blake, Late Mrs. Helen
Estate of—Efforts made to Trace Heirs, etc.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, Mr. Atkinson, *Aug. 4*, 996, 997.

Blundell, Col. H. B. H. [Lancashire, Ince]
Committee of Defence, Reconstitution of, *Aug. 2*, 629.

Board of Agriculture
see Agriculture, Board of.

Board of Education
see Education, Board of.

Board of Trade
see Trade, Board of.

Board of Works, Ireland
see Works, Board of, Ireland

Boilers
see under Navy.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, S.]
Art, Irish, Conditions of Grant-in-Aid of, *Aug. 1*, 280.
Cooscroum Boat Slip, Improvement of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1358.
Dublin — Marlborough Street Training College — Arrangements as to New Building, *Aug. 8*, 1358.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Measures Smuggled through by means of, without Discussion, *Aug. 9*, 1694.
Irish Lace, Counterfeit, Sale of, in Nice, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1368.
National School Teachers — Assistant, Average School Attendance required for Appointment of, *Aug. 3*, 729.

Boma
Natives, Ill-treatment of, *see under* Congo Free State.

Boscawen, Captain A. S. T. G. [Kent, Tonbridge]
Militia, Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1447–1450.

Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]
Africa, South, British Banks in—Claims for Specie Commandeered by late South African Republic, *Aug. 4*, 998.
Balkans, Agreement by Russia and Austria as to Countries South of, *Aug. 4*, 978.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1239, 1242–1244.
France — Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain—Egyptian Clauses, Turkish Assent to, *Aug. 8*, 1352.
Holloway Gaol—Prisoners under Remand, Hair-cutting Regulations for, *Aug. 4*, 983.
Imports of Manufactured and Partly Manufactured Articles, Return as to, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1554.
Merchant Shipping — Board of Trade Notices as to danger in approaching Squadrons of Warships, *Aug. 5*, 1215.
Post Office Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 159.
Public Accounts Committee Report, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug. 1*, 283.
Revenue and Expenditure, Committee Report on, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug. 1*, 282.
Russo-Japanese War—British Vessels, Detention and Search of, by Russian Cruisers.
“Knight Commander,” Inquiry as to Sinking of, *Aug. 8*, 1373, 1374.

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
Russo-Japanese War—*cont.*
“Malacca,” Inquiry and Protest by British Government as to, *Aug. 8*, 1371–1373.
Savings Bank, Post Office.
Business in 1903 and first six months of 1904, Particulars as to, Reason for Liabilities exceeding Assets, etc., *Aug. 1*, 255, 270.
Report, Date of presenting, *Aug. 1*, 255, 270.
Shop Hours Bill, *Con.*, *Aug 5*, 1273.
Supply Business, Arrears of, *Aug. 2*, 553.
Twelve O'clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of Session, *Aug. 2*, 554, 555.
Fridays, Exemption of, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 588.
Vaccination Exemption Certificates, Difficulty in obtaining, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1355.

Boyne River
Salmon Fisheries Close Season—Assimilation of dates in different districts proposed.
Qs. Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 274.

Bradford Corporation Act (1903)
Costs, Irregularity in Report on, Agreement of Parties to Compromise, etc.
O. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Aug. 8*, 1284.

Brassey, Lord
Navy.
Shipbuilding — Class of Ships to be built, Increased Expenditure on, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1521–1525.
Simon's Bay, Expenditure on Works at, *Aug. 9*, 1522.

Brazil
Boundary between British Guiana and—Award of King of Italy with regard to, Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1095, 1211.

Bridlington Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** *Aug. 1*, 252.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1209.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.*,* *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley]
Parliament — House of Commons — Post Office in Lobby, Enlargement of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1564.

Bright, Mr. [Salop, Oswestry]
Education [Local Authority Default] Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1264.
Exchequer Bonds, proposed issue of—Effect on price of Consols, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1216.

Bristol, Marquess of
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1199, 1200.

Bristol Corporation Bill.
c. Con. Aug. 2,* 507.
3R.* *Aug. 5,* 1209.
l. Commons' Amendments *Con.,* Aug. 8,* 1281.

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill
c. Con., Aug. 5,* 1210.
3R.* *Aug. 9.* 1539.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.,* Aug. 9,* 1489.

British South Africa Company
see Chartered Company of South Africa.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
Factories and Workshops—Women Inspectors, Inadequate number of, etc., *Aug. 4,* 1031.
Fish-curing Trade—Conditions of labour imposed on Women, etc., *Aug. 4,* 1030, 1031.
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9,* 1613.
Shop Hours Bill, *Con., Aug. 5,* 1274.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John F.—*Secretary of State for India* [Surrey, Guildford]
Africa, South—Horses, Sale of, after the War, *Aug. 9,* 1681, 1682.
Agricultural Banks in India, Number of, established, etc., *Aug. 4,* 968.
Army, Indian.
British Riding Masters and Quartermasters, Pay of, *Aug 3,* 715.
Equipment other than rifles and guns manufactured in India during last two years, *Aug. 4,* 967.
Expenditure, Proposals as to reduction in, *Aug. 2,* 615.
Imperial Cadet Corps, Members of Indian aristocracy in, Number of commissions to be conferred annually, etc., *Aug. 9,* 1560.
Knox, Sir C., and other Officers—Payment of Salaries to, after disallowance by the Treasury, *Aug. 9,* 1684.
Loan of Troops for Imperial purposes, Saving effected by, *Aug. 9,* 1559.
Assam.
Cherra, Procedure in filling vacant Siemship of, *Aug. 4,* 967.
Dibrugarh, Excessive Sentence on Native at, alleged, *Aug. 9,* 1556.
Curzon, Lord, Departmental history of administration of—Making public, proposed, *Aug. 8,* 1342.
Finance — Saving effected by loan of Troops for Imperial purposes, *Aug. 9,* 1559.
Government Departments — Salaries and Distribution of work—Return proposed, *Aug. 8,* 1351.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John F.—*cont.*
Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *Aug. 9,* 1691.
Irrigation, Commission on—Progress as to adopting Recommendations, *Aug. 4,* 968.
Japan, Indian subject requested by, to return to India, alleged, *Aug. 9,* 1559.
Police, Report on.
Proposals relative to, Delay in presenting, *Aug. 4,* 968.
Recommendations of, as to Village Police, etc., *Aug. 2,* 520.
Public Accounts Committee Report, Criticisms on, *Aug. 9,* 1681, 1682.
Tibet Expedition — Number of Tibetans killed and wounded, *Aug. 1,* 268.

Brotherton, Mr. E. A. [Wakefield]
Telephone Service — Six minute Trunk calls from 8 p.m. on Saturdays to 8 a.m. on Mondays, proposed, *Aug. 8,* 1340.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
University of Liverpool Bill, *Com., July 29,* 159.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Arberdeen, S.]
Cunard Agreement, Facilities for adequate discussion of, *Aug. 3,* 830, 831.
Edinburgh.
Art Institutions in—State contributions towards upkeep of, etc., *Aug. 9,* 1582, 1583.
Manufactures, Board of, Reconstitution of, *Aug. 9,* 1583, 1584.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com., Aug. 5,* 1224, 1240.
Proposals as to taking, *Aug. 9,* 1567.
Education (Scotland) Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2,* 567.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5,* 1277.
Macedonia—Reorganisation of *gendarmerie*—Increase of Russian and Austrian officers, alleged, *Aug. 4,* 962, 977, 978.
Parliamentary Procedure—Failure of new Rules, *Aug. 2,* 567.
Port of London Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2,* 567.
Shop Hours Bill, Date of taking, *Aug .4,* 1001.
Supply, Discussion of, *Aug. 3,* 734.
Transvaal — Representative government, Proposals as to, *Aug. 2,* 525.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R. [Perthshire, E.]
Capital Expenditure (Money) Resolution, Objections to taking, after 12 o'clock, *Aug. 2,* 652.
Education (Scotland) Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2,* 556, 557.

[*cont.*

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*cont.*

Parliament—House of Commons—Telegraph Office in Members' Lobby, Defective Ventilation of, alleged, *Aug. 4*, 963.

Private Members' Rights, Infringement of, *Aug. 2*, 557, 558.

Somaliland, Supplementary Estimate for, Date of introducing, *Aug 2*, 556.

Supply Business, Arrears of, etc., *Aug 2*, 558, 559.

Twelve o'clock Rule, Suspension of—Controversial character of business to be taken after 12 o'clock, *Aug. 2*, 555, 556.

Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds—Estimated amount required, etc., *Aug. 2*, 663, 664.

Budget

Protective Character of the proposals. References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 37, 38.

Burghclere, Lord

Finance Bill, Date of bringing, before the House of Lords, Inadequate opportunity for discussion, etc., *July 29*, 19.

Licensing Bill.

2R., *Aug. 2*, 427–436.

Com., *Aug. 4*, 886, 927; *Aug. 5*, 1116–1118, 1206.

Militia—Reform Proposals, *July 29*, 63, 69.

Burke, Mr. E. H. [King's County, Tullamore]

Ballymacrossin—Estate of Major Fox, Sale of—Reinstatement of Miss Masterson, etc., *Aug. 4*, 991.

Burke, Isadore, Estate

Sale of—Grazing lands, Particulars as to disposal of.

Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 974.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]

Accidents, Decrease in Number of—Number due to Americanisation of British Labour, *Aug. 4*, 1022, 1023.

Dressmaking trade—Hours of work and overtime, Inadequate number of women inspectors, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1023, 1024.

Factories and Workshops—Inspectors, Work done by, Inadequate Staff, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1020–1022.

Infant Mortality, Rate of, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1024, 1025.

Lead Poisoning, Increase in, *Aug. 4*, 1024, 1025, 1029.

Physical Deterioration—Effect of Factory Work, *Aug. 4*, 1024, 1025.

Business of the House

Bills, *see that title.*

Conduct of, by Mr. Balfour, Criticisms on.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 2*, 470–475; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 578, 579, 581; Mr. T. M. Healy, 582–585.

Course of.
Os. Mr. McKenna, Mr. MacVeagh, *Aug. 9*, 1689; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1689, 1690, 1705; Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. H. Samuel, 1690; Mr. Helme, 1705.

Balfour, Mr. A. J., Replies of, to Questions and Criticisms, *Aug. 3*, 734, 735; *Aug. 4*, 1001, 1002; *Aug. 8*, 1377, 1378; *Aug. 9*, 1567.

Days occupied by Government, and by Private Members—Return ordered, *Aug. 2*, 512; Presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.

Midnight, Controversial nature of business to be taken after.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Aug. 2*, 554, 555; Mr. Buchanan, 555, 556.

Opposed Private Business being disposed of at an Evening Sitting, any Motion contingent directly or otherwise thereon may be considered and disposed of at the same sitting—Amendment of Standing Order, *Aug. 9*, 1544.

Private Members' Rights, Non-interference with, during present session.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 542; Mr. Buchanan, 557, 558.

Supply Business, Arrears of, and inadequate opportunity for discussion.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 2*, 552, 553; Mr. G. Bowles, 553; Mr. Buchanan, 558, 559; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 579, 581.

Twelve O'clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of Session.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 542; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 548; Sir C. Dilke 550; Mr. G. Bowles, 554, 555; Mr. W. Churchill, 569.

Fridays, Exemption of, proposed.
Os. Mr. E. Griffith, *Aug. 2*, 585; 586; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Lough, Mr. Delany, Mr. Moss, 587; Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. C. Warner, Mr. Labouchere, 588.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]

Africa, South—Railways taken over by the Military during the War—Price paid, Authority responsible, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1684.

Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 566.

Army—Sir C. Knox and other Officers, Payment of Salaries to, after disallowance by the Treasury, *Aug 9*, 1683, 1684.

Business of the House, Course of, *Aug. 9*, 1690.

[*cont*

Buxton, Mr. S. C. —*cont.*
Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill.
Information as to Expenditure involved in, *Aug. 8*, 1341.
2R. *Aug. 8*, 1482.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill.
Com., *Aug 5*, 1226.
Proposals as to, *Aug. 8*, 1377.
Exchequer Bonds, Treasury borrowings on, *Aug. 8*, 1482.
Expiring Laws, Continuance Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 9*, 1693, 1698.
Port of London Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 565, 566.
Public Accounts Committee Report—Breaches of Regulations and Unconstitutional Practices revealed by, *Aug. 9*, 1683, 1684.
Transvaal — Importation of Chinese Labour to—Offices and Depôts—Authority responsible for cost of erecting depôts, *Aug. 1*, 267.

Buxton Urban District Council Bill
*c. Con.** *Aug. 2*, 507.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1209.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.**, *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Cadogan, Earl
County of Suffolk Bill, 2R. *Aug. 2*, 396.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanarkshire, Mid.]
Cunard Agreement, Terms of, *Aug. 8*, 1474.
Edinburgh, Art Institutions in, Re-housing and upkeep of, *Aug. 9*, 1588.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R. *Aug. 5*, 1279.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 548.
Business of the House.
Bills not introduced and Bills abandoned during present Session, *Aug. 2*, 548, 549.
Bills still remaining to be dealt with, *Aug. 2*, 548, 549.
Education (Scotland) Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 548, 549.
Fiscal Policy—Action of Ministers in accepting official positions in the Liberal Unionist Association, etc., *Aug. 1*, 284-296.
Licensing Bill, 3R. *July 29*, 99, 143.
Revenue and Expenditure, Committee Report on, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug. 1*, 282.
Transvaal—Representative Government, Proposals as to, *Aug. 2*, 525.

Camperdown, Earl of
Finance Bill.
Date of bringing, before the House of Lords, inadequate opportunity for discussion, etc., *July 29*, 10-12.
3R. *July 29*, 43.
Licensing Bill.
Com. Aug. 4, 942; *Aug. 5*, 1105, 1118, 1140, 1142, 1143.
Rep. *Aug 8*, 1290, 1324.

Canada
British troops in—Number, cost, Canadian contribution etc.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 29*, 89.

Canals, Ireland
Monasterevan and Castlecomer—Expenditure of grant proposed in 1801 towards Construction.
Q. Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham *Aug. 1*, 263.
Royal Canal, Progress made in dredging.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 4*, 997, 998.

Canterbury, Lord Archbishop of
Licensing Bill.
2R. *Aug. 1*, 187-196.
Com. Aug. 4, 876-885; *Aug. 5*, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1189, 1191, 1194, 1205.
Rep. *Aug. 8*, 1301, 1307, 1313, 1323.
3R. *Aug. 9*, 1502-1504.

Capital Expenditure
see under Revenue and Expenditure.

Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill
c. 1R.* *Aug. 3*, 829.
2R. *Aug. 8*, 1479.
Information as to expenditure involved.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 8*, 1341.

Cardiff Railway Bill
l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.** *Aug. 1*, 161.

Carlisle. Earl of
Licensing Bill.
2R. *Aug. 2*, 447 451.
Com. Aug. 4, 870; *Aug. 5*, 1127, 1135, 1137, 1195, 1197, 1198.

Carlisle Corporation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *Aug. 2*, 393.
3R.* *Aug. 9*, 1489.

Carnarvonshire
National Schools—Variations sanctioned as to proportion of foundation managers,
Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 9*, 1553.

Carrington, Earl
- Expenditure of the Country, Increase in, *July 29*, 44.
- Finance Bill.
  - Date of bringing, before the House of Lords—Necessity for passing before 1st Aug., etc., *July 29*, 20–24.
  - *Com. July 29*, 41.
  - 3R. *July 29*, 44.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 871, 943; *Aug. 5*, 1132, 1133, 1146.

Carson, Sir E. H.—*Solicitor-General* [Dublin University]
- Licensing Bill, 3R. *July 29*, 98,100.

Cashen, Ireland
- Salmon Fishery—Inquiry as to extinction of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 994.

Castlecomer
- Canal connecting with Monasterevan projected in 1801—Expenditure of Grant-in-Aid.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 263.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Derbyshire, W.]
- Blake, Estate of late Mrs. Helen—Efforts made to trace heirs, etc., *Aug. 4*, 996.
- Canal, Royal, Progress made in Dredging, *Aug. 4*, 998.
- Government Offices, Temporary Assistants in—Pay, Deduction on joining Permanent Staff, etc., *Aug. 1*, 280.
- Ireland.
  - Ardandra Castle, Preservation of, as Ancient Monument, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 961.
  - Art, Conditions of Grant-in-Aid of, *Aug. 1*, 281.
  - Ballinrobe to Claremorris Railway—Guarantee, Conditions of, *Aug. 8*, 1334.
  - Barrow River Drainage Schemes, Government Assistance in, *Aug. 2*, 536.
  - Labourers' Cottages, Loans for—Rate of interest, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1369, 1370.
  - National Library—Reason for making Deduction from Salary of Mr. Evans, *Aug. 1*, 280.
  - Portavogie Harbour, Improvements in, *Aug. 3*, 731.
  - Rum and Black River Drainage district, Expenditure on, Liability for, etc., *Aug. 1*, 279.
  - Scariff River, Examination of, with a view to drainage, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 969.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*cont.*
- Irish Society—Particulars as to mortgages held by Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, *July 29*, 85.
- Liquor Licences, Duty on—Disparity of present System, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1562.

Cawdor, Earl
- Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, *Com. Aug. 5*, 1093.

Cecil, Lord H. R. H. [Greenwich].
- Fiscal Policy of the country, proposeed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 330-340.

Chairman
- Cunard Agreement (Money) Resolution, Propriety of discussing terms of the Agreement on, *Aug. 2*, 692.
- Debate adjourned—Possibility of proceeding with other business, *Aug, 5*, 1273.
- Deputy
  - Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Subjects in order for discussion on Clause 1, *Aug. 9*, 1697, 1704.
  - King's Name, Introduction of, in debate, *Aug. 3*, 746.
- Education (Local Authority Default) Bill.
  - Amendments,
    - Not in Order, *Aug. 5*, 1235.
    - Postponement of a sub-section, not admissible, *Aug. 5*, 1220.
  - Closure of, without discussion of Amendments, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1260–1265.
  - Division—Refusal of Members to enter the Lobbies, *Aug. 5*, 1259, 1262, 1264, 1265.
  - Drafting of, Powers of Chairman to deal with, *Aug. 5*, 1221, 1222.
  - Irrelevant Matter, introduction of, *Aug. 5*, 1221, 1230.
  - Marginal Notes, alteration of, *Aug. 5*, 1223.
  - Members named for disregarding the authority of the chair, *Aug. 5* 1265, 1266.
  - Motion to report Progress, *Aug. 5*, 1222.
- Insinuations against the Prime Minister in the course of debate, Ruling as to, *Aug. 5*, 1226.
- Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *Aug. 9*, 1598.
- Number of times a Member may speak in Committee, no rule as to, *Aug. 2*, 655.
- Unparliamentary language, use of, *Aug. 2*, 654, 655, 680.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, W.]
- Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 340–348.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A., *Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Worcestershire, E.].
- Banks in Ireland—Arrangements with Bank of Ireland and Provincial Bank for keeping Government accounts—adoption of Scotch and English system, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 979, 980.
- Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill.
  - Information as to Expenditure involved in, *Aug. 8*, 1341.
  - 2R. *Aug. 8*, 1482.
- Committee of Defence—Secretary, information as to salary of, *Aug. 2*, 642.
- Consols, Price of—Effect of proposed issue of Exchequer Bonds, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1216.
- Exchequer Bonds.
  - Borrowings on, authorising, *Aug. 2*, 649–651, 663, 664; *Aug. 8*, 1482–1484.
  - Issue of—Effect on price of Consols, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1216.
- Government Offices, Uniformity of practice in, as to Weekly Half Holiday, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 261.
- Revenue and Expenditure—Irish Contribution, Basis of calculation of, *Aug. 2*, 536, 537.
- Spirits.
  - Bond, Removals from—Regulations as to permits—Excise control over spirits after removal, etc., *Aug. 4*, 980, 981.
  - Distilleries, British, Production of, in 1901, 1902, 1903, etc., *Aug. 1*, 261.
- Transvaal—Estimates, Absence from, of provision for payment of war contribution, *Aug. 1*, 270.
- Uganda Railway, Reasons for raising further money for, *Aug. 2*, 667.
- Works.
  - Capital Expenditure, estimated amount of Borrowings for, *Aug. 2*, 650; *Aug. 3*, 616; *Aug. 8*, 1482, 1483.
  - Exchequer Bonds, authorising borrowings on, for purposes of, *Aug. 2*, 649, 651, 663, 664; *Aug. 8*, 1482–1484.

Chamberlayne, Mr. T. [Southampton].
- Patent Medicines, Restrictions on Advertisements of, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 518.
- Crown Rights, Revenues drawn from—Return presented, *Aug. 3*, 706.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.—*Sir W. H. Walrond.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer.—*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
- Licensing Bill, 3R, *July 29*, 107.

Chanonry Ferry, Scotland
- Closing of, inconvenience to public, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 1*, 257.

Chantry Trust
- Report of Select Committee, with proceedings and Minutes of Evidence—Communicating to the Commons, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1379.

Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland) Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

Charities
- St. Katherine's Hospital, Regent's Park—Reforms in administration of endowment—opportunity for discussion, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Cremer; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 999, 1000.
- Whitstable Scheme, Provisions of—Local opposition, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Slack; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 540.

Chartered Company of South Africa
- Payments to, Vouchers for
  - *O.* Mr. Whitley, *Aug. 9*, 1687.
- Rhodesia, delegates from — Cancelling charter, discussing terms of – obtaining Parliamentary approval of terms, proposed, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour; *Aug. 1*, 253, 254.
  - *Q.* Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 3*, 717.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
- Shop Hours Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 5*, 1271, 1272.

Chester, Lord Bishop of
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 856; *Rep.*, *Aug. 8*, 1319.

Chief Secretary for Ireland.— *Mr. G. Wyndham.*

Children
- Employment of
  - Act.
    - Administration of
      - *Os.* Sir J. Gorst, *Aug. 4*, 1014–1016; Mr. A. Douglas, 1041, 1042.
    - Byelaws under—Number of Irish local authorities making, etc.
      - *Q.* Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 29*, 87, 88.
  - Rules to be submitted to Local Authorities, progress made with.
    - *Os.* Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1009; Sir J. Gorst, 1014, 1015; Mr. A. Douglas, 1041, 1042.
  - Street selling—Reasons for non-enforcement of the law.
    - *Os.* Sir J. Gorst, *Aug. 4*, 1015; Mr. Crooks, 1050.
- Poor Law, *see that title.*

China
- Coolie Labour for the Transvaal, *see title* Transvaal, *subheading* Chinese Labour.
- Geneva Convention, Accession of China to, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.
- Mails to—Contract with Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. for conveyance of—Copy Ordered, *Aug. 4*, 954.
- Tibet, *see that title.*
- Tung Ting Lake, German endeavour to lease, alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. Norman; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 9*, 1560, 1561.
- Wei-hai-wei, Terms of holding, negotiations as to modification, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Norman; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 9*, 1561.

China and Earthenware Factories
- Dilapidated premises, Powers of Inspectors to order improvements and repairs in.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 3*, 710.

Church of England
- Ritualistic Practices—Committee Report, date of presenting.
  - *Qs.* Mr. A. Taylor, Dr. Hutchinson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 281.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S. [Oldham].
- Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 571.
- Army.
  - Army Corps System, Abandonment of, *Aug. 8*, 1411.
  - Changes effected in, during the last ten years, *Aug. 8*, 1409, 1410.
  - Linked Battalions System, Abandonment of, *Aug. 8*, 1412, 1413.
  - Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1410–1419.
- Business of the House, Criticisms on Mr. A. J. Balfour's conduct of, *Aug. 2*, 470–475.
- Capital Expenditure (Money) Resolution, Objections to taking, after 12 o'clock, *Aug. 2*, 653.
- Committee, Rule as to number of times a Member may speak in, *Aug. 2*, 655.
- Committee of Defence.
  - Constitution and Functions of, *Aug. 2*, 630–633.
  - Prime Minister as head of, *Aug. 2*, 631.
  - Secretariat, Constitution and duties of, *Aug. 2*, 630, 631.
  - Secretary, Information as to Salary of, *Aug. 2*, 641, 642, 644.
- Cunard Agreement.
  - Facilities for Discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 683.
  - Terms of *Aug. 2*, 691–693.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1229, 1265.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.
  - 2R., *Aug. 4*, 1079.
  - Measures smuggled through by means of, without discussion, *Aug. 4*, 1079.
- Financial Position of the Country—Report of National Expenditure Committee, etc., *Aug. 2*, 570; *Aug. 3*, 818–822.
- Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1277.
- Militia, Condition of—Reform Proposals, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1415, 1416.
- Revenue and Expenditure—Committee Report on, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug, 1*, 282.
- Savings Banks—Falling-off of investments in, *Aug. 3*, 819.
- Shop Hours Bill.
  - Proceeding with, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 654.
  - *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1269, 1270.
- Transvaal, Representative Government, Proposals as to, Opportunity for discussion, etc, *Aug. 2*, 526.
- Twelve O'Clock Rule—Suspension of, for remainder of Session, *Aug. 2*, 569.
- Volunteers—Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1416–1418.
- Works—Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug. 3*, 817–822.

Churchyards or Cemeteries
- Acquisition of—Deposit of Copies of Plans and Sections—Standing Order relating to, *Aug. 9*, 1490, 1491.

Civil Service
- Report of Commissioners Presented, *Aug. 2*, 396, 509.
- Retirement Regulations—Retention of certain Servants after the age of sixty-five—Treasury Minute stating Circumstances, Ordered, *Aug. 3*, 708, Presented, *Aug. 4*, 953.

Civil Service Estimates
- Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain—£26,300, *Com.* Aug 9*, 1639.
- Bankruptcy Department of Board of Trade—£9, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- Board of Agriculture and Fisheries—£54,337, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- Board of Education—£5,238,437, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1649.
- British Museum—£90,171 *Com.* Aug. 9* 1649.
- British Protectorates in Uganda, etc.—£420,700 *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1654.
- Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum—£21,701, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1646.

[*cont.*

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
- Charity Commission—£14,633, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- Civil Service Commission—£25,110 *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.
- Colonial Office—£27,750, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- Colonial Services—£305,421, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1654.
- County Courts—£23,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1645.
- Diplomatic and Consular Buildings—£38,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1639.
- Diplomatic and Consular Services—£303,067, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1653.
- Exchequer and Audit Department—£39,054, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.
- Foreign Office—£35,771, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- Friendly Societies Registry—£4,881, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.
- Home Department, Salaries and Expenses of Office of—£104,094, *Com. Aug. 4*, 1002; *Aug. 9*, 1641.
- House of Commons Offices—£21,060, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- House of Lords Offices—£9,868, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- Ireland
  - Charitable Donations and Bequests Office—£1,148, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1643.
  - Chief Secretary, Expenses of Offices of, and Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums—£14,371, *Com. Aug. 3*, 736; *Aug. 9*, 1643.
  - County Court Officers, etc.—£66,584, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1647.
  - Development Grant—£1,000, **Com. Aug. 9*, 1660.
    - Revised Estimate, presented, *Aug. 4*, 953.
  - Dublin Metropolitan Police—£37,961, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1647.
  - Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum,—£3,715, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1648.
  - Endowed Schools Commissioners—£535, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1650.
  - Hospitals and Charities—£300, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1656.
  - Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions — £33,416, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1646.
  - Local Government Board — £37,886, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1644.
  - Lord-Lieutenant's Household—£2,826, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1643.
  - National Gallery—£582, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1650.
  - Prisons—£65,476, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1647.
  - Public Education—£633,625, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1650.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Public Record Office—£3,254, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1644.
  - Public Works and Buildings—£110,737, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1640.
  - Public Works Office—£21,773, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1644.
  - Queen's Colleges, Grant in Aid for Expenses of—£2,300, *Com. Aug. 3*, 788; *Aug. 9*, 1650.
  - Railways—£27,815, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1640.
  - Reformatory and Industrial Schools—£53,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1647.
  - Registrar-General's Office — £6,716, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1644.
  - Royal Irish Constabulary—£739,608, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1647.
  - Supreme Court of Judicature, etc.—£57,718, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1646.
  - Valuation and Boundary Survey—£13,207, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1644.
- Land Registry—£28,827, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1645.
- Law Charges—£35,232, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1645.
- Local Government Board—£142,089, *Com. Aug. 9*, 1642.
- Mercantile Marine Services — £69,251, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.
- Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions—£600, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1656
- Mint, including coinage—£63, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.
- Miscellaneous Charitable and other allowances—£617, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1656.
- Miscellaneous Expenses—£5,098, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1659.
- Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain—£40,700, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1638.
- Miscellaneous Legal Expenses — £22,199, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1645 .
- National Debt Office—£7,439, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.
- National Gallery—£7,065, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1649.
- National Portrait Gallery—£2,682, *Cm. Aug. 9*, 1649.
- Osborne—£10,550, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1638.
- Police, England and Wales — £25,854, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1645.
- Post Office.
  - Packet Service—£536,420, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1669, 1670.
  - Telegraph Service—£2,615,509, *Com. Aug. 9*, 1600.
- Prisons, England and the Colonies—£375,762, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1645.
- Privy Council Office—£5,680, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.

[*cont.*

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*

Public Buildings, Great Britain—£290,900, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1639.

Public Record Office — £14,965, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Public Works Loan Commission—£7, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Rates on Government Property—£332,277, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1640.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain—£113,957, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1646.

Registrar-General's Office—£22,146, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Repayment to Civil Contingencies Fund—£16,757, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1660.

Repayments to Local Loans Fund—£5,642, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1660.

Royal Parks and Pleasure Grounds—£69,100, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1638.

St. Louis Exhibition, 1904—£10,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1660.

Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom — £24,407, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1649.

Scotland.

Crofters Commission—£2,590, *Com.* Aug.* 9, 1646.

Discussion, Opportunity for.

Q. Master of Elibank ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 283.

Fishery Board—£10,155, *Com.* Aug 9*, 1642.

Law Charges and Courts of Law—£54.148, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1646.

Local Government Board—£9,598, *Com. Aug 9*, 1591.

Lunacy Commission — £3,423, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.

National Gallery—£1,550, *Com. Aug. 9*, 1568.

Peterhead Harbour — £22,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1639.

Prisons—£50,570, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1646.

Public Education—£1,003,724, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1650.

Register House, Edinburgh—£27,678, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1646.

Registrar-General's Office — £2,732, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1643.

Secretary for Scotland's Office — £10,495, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Secret Service—£25,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Stationery and Printing—£404,362, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Superannuation and Retired Allowances—£339,729, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1656.

Supplementary — Committee of Imperial Defence, Expenses of — £2,960, *Com. Aug. 2*, 601.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*

Supreme Court of Judicature—£177,515, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1645.

Surveys of the United Kingdom—£120,409, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1639.

Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable – £52,100, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1654.

Temporary Commissions—£25,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1659.

Treasury and Subordinate Offices—£54,639 *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1641.

Treasury Chest Fund — £49,000, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1654.

Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales—£103,200, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1650.

Wallace Collection—£3,539, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1649.

Woods, Forests, etc., Office of — £13,171, *Com.,* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Works and Public Buildings Office—£39,649. *Com.,* Aug. 9*, 1642.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co. N.]

Roman Catholic University, need for, *Aug. 3*, 788-792.

Clanmorris, Lord, Estate of

Sale of, Particulars as to negotiations for.

Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 973.

Clergy

West Indies, Amount payable out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical purposes—Return presented, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1546.

Clocaenog, Denbighshire

Burial dispute—Refusal of parish bier by rector, alleged.

Qs. Mr. H. Roberts ; *As.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 528 ; *Aug. 9*, 1548, 1549.

Closure of Debate

Application of Standing Order No. 26—Return as to, ordered, *Aug. 2*, 510 ; presented, 707.

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill

l. Rep.* *Aug. 2*, 393.

3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Coal

Export of, to Japan and Russia, quantity exported during 1904, Government Control of export of smokeless steam coal, etc.

Qs. Sir L. Knowles ; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1357.

Q. Sir L. Knowles ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1376.

Production, Consumption, Imports and Exports, etc.—Statistical Tables relating to, presented, *July 29*, 1319.

Coaling Stations
Garrisoning of.
Qs. Sir J. Colomb, *Aug. 2*, 606; Capt. Norton, 609.

Coghill, Mr. D. H. [Stoke-upon-Trent.]
Lead Poisoning in the Potteries, number of cases of, *Aug. 4*, 1029, 1030.

Coins and Coinage
Counterfeit coins—descriptions of counterfeiting process given in newspapers.
Qs. Mr. T. Taylor, *Aug. 4*, 1034; Mr. A. Douglas, 1045, 1046.

Colchester Camp
Straw Contracts, allocation of.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 3*, 716.

Colehill
Gamekeeper, right of, to demand production of licences on public road.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 992, 993.

Coleridge, Lord
County Courts Bill, Rep., *July 29*, 75.
Finance Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 23; *Com. July 29*, 41; 3R. *July 29*, 44.
Date of bringing before the House of Lords—inadequate opportunity for discussion, etc. *July 29*, 13, 14.
Financial position of the country—Increase in expenditure and taxation, *July 29*, 23–28, 44.
Income Tax, increase in, *July 29*, 26.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 848–851, 859, 874, 876, 932, 944; *Aug. 5*, 1110, 1113, 1144, 1146, 1165, 1172.
Orange River Colony, Proposals as to representative Government for, *Aug. 5*, 1101.
Tea, additional 2d. per pound on, *July 29*, 25.
Transvaal, Administration of—Proposals as to representative Government, *Aug. 5*, 1101.
Unclaimed Dividends, appropriation of, towards Budget deficit, *July 29*, 41.

Colomb, Sir J. C. R. [Great Yarmouth]
Coaling Stations, garrisoning of, *Aug. 2*, 606.
Committee of Defence
Co-ordination of the two Services effected by, *Aug. 2*, 604, 605, 607.
Discussion of problems of defence as a whole facilitated by establishment of, *Aug. 2*, 604, 605.
Supplementary Estimate for expenses of, *Aug. 2*, 604.
Constabulary, Royal Irish, Complaints against, notice as to procedure in, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1556.

Colomb, Sir J. C. R.—*cont.*
Irish Land Bill, Proposals as to, *Aug. 8*, 1378.
Navy, Strength of—Two Power Standard, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1072–1074.
Poor Law Children—Boarding out system—Payments to cottagers, revision of present arrangements for, proposed, *Aug. 5*, 1212.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton.
Parliamentary Secretary—Duke of Marlborough.

Colonies
Annual Reports presented, *Aug. 3*, 707; *Aug. 4*, 839.
Fiscal question, Conference on, proposed.
Qs. Mr. C. M'Arthur, Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1374, 1375.
Import Duties levied by—Return relating to, presented, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.
Statistical Abstracts and Tables from 1889 to 1903 presented, *Aug. 9*, 1495, 1547.

Committee of Defence
see under Defence of the Empire.

Committees
House of Commons.
Number appointed in Session, 1904—Subjects of Inquiry, Names of Members, etc.—Return Ordered, *Aug. 2*, 511; presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.
Police and Sanitary Committee, Special Report from, presented, *Aug. 5*, 1219.

Common Lodging Houses
Sanitary Condition of—Necessity for legislation.
Qs. Mr. T. Taylor, *Aug. 4*, 1033, 1034.

Common Prayer, Book of
New edition of—alterations in punctuation, omissions, etc.
Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 4*, 958, 959.

Commons or Common Lands
Acquisition of—Deposit of copies of plans and sections—Standing Order relating to, *Aug. 9*, 1490, 1491.

Companies
Winding-up—Board of Trade General Annual Report, presented, *Aug. 4*, 840, 954.

Compulsory Military Service
Cost of—Statement showing basis on which estimate of £25,900,000, was made, presented, *Aug. 1*, 252; *Aug. 2*, 395.

[*cont.*

Compulsory Miliary Service—*cont.*

Financial aspect of the proposal.
O. Capt. Norton, *Aug. 8*, 1443, 1444,

Norfolk Commission Recommendations.
O. Mr. Llewellyn, *Aug. 8*, 1420.
Q. Col. Llewellyn ;*A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 2.* 522, 523.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland

Athlone—Bog in Parish of St. John's, purchase of.—Turbary rights of former tenants.
Q. Mr. Hayden ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1342, 1343.

Burke, Isadore, Estate—Particulars as to disposal of grazing lands.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 974.

Transactions under Land Act, 1903, up to 31st July, 1904, particulars as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 971.

Congested Districts Board, Scotland

Lewis, Island of—Delay in Construction of Cromore-Gravir Road.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 4*, 957.

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill

Date of proceeding with, etc.
Os. Mr. Weir, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 544.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 539.
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

Congo

Free State—Boma, ill-treatment of Natives in—Case of M. de Tiège.
Q. Mr. Emmott ; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 975, 976.

French—British Merchants, claims of—Interpretation of free trade clauses of Berlin Act—Progress of negotiations.
Q. Mr. C. McArthur ; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 1*, 268, 269.

Consols

Price of, Effect of proposed issue of Exchequer Bonds, etc.
Q. Mr. Bright ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 5*, 1216.

Constabulary (Ireland) Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1487.

Constabulary, Royal Irish

Anderson, Constable—Charges against.
Inquiry into circumstances of the case, and antecedents of Constable Anderson, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Devlin, *Aug. 3*, 747 ; Mr. W. Moore, 753 ; Mr. J. Redmond, 778 ; Mr. Hemphill, 787.

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*

Anderson, Constable, etc.—*cont.*

MacDonnell, Sir A.—Insinuations against.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Aug 3*, 740, 741 ; Mr. W. Moore, 751–753, 757, 758 ; Mr. Wyndham, 763, 764, 768, 785, 786 ; Mr. C. Craig, 772, 773 ; Mr. Gordon, 775 ; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 776.

Miscarriage of justice—Conspiracy on part of Roman Catholics, alleged.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Aug. 3*, 738, 739, 741, 742 ; Mr. W. Moore, 750, 754, 755 ; Mr. Sloan, 770, 771 ; Mr. Gordon, 775.

Official Papers and Correspondence relating to—Tabling.
Os. Mr. J. Devlin, *Aug. 3*, 749 ; Mr. W. Moore, 753.
Qs. Mr. Dillon, Mr. S. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 724.

O'Hara, Father, Campaign against Anderson initiated by.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Aug. 3*, 739–741 ; Mr. J. Devlin, 748–750 ; Mr. W. Moore, 753–755 , Mr. Wyndham, 764–766 ; Mr. Gordon, 775 ; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 776 ; Sir J. Haslett, 787, 788.

Re-instatement of Anderson, grounds for.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Aug. 3*, 739 ; Mr. J. Devlin, 748 ; Mr. W. Moore, 758 ; Mr. Wyndham, 769 ; Mr. C. Craig, 773.

Second Inquiry, Circumstances of—

Suppression of Evidence, etc.
Os. Mr. W. Moore, *Aug. 3*, 755–757 ; Mr. S. MacNeill, 756 ; Col. Saunderson, 756 ; Mr. Wyndham, 760, 761, 767–769.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. S. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 724, 725.

Sheridan Case, Connection with, Denial of— Tabling papers of Sheridan case, proposed.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 727, 728.

Armagh — Flags displayed on licensed premises, prohibition of.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 715.

Complaints against, Procedure as to—Issuing notice, proposed.
Q. Sir J. Colomb ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 9*, 1556.

[*cont.*

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*
Dublin County, South—arrangements as to manning certain police stations, tabling correspondence as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 728.
Extra Police, Charges for.
Legal powers of recovery, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1365, 1366.
Method of levying, in certain counties.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, *Aug. 3*, 779–783; Mr. Wyndham, 783–785.
Glanquin, Force stationed at.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 993.
Prisoners, Testimony of Police as to characters of—Letter written by Head Constable Smith, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 5*, 1217.
Recruits, number of, from March 1903 to March 1904.
Q. Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 726.
Retirement, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 5*, 1216, 1217.
Robinson, Constable—Marriage against regulations and refusal to support wife, alleged.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1359.
Roundstone—Display of flags on licensed premises—Illegal prohibition by Constabulary—Complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Aug. 3*, 743, 744; Mr. C. Craig, 772; Mr. Wyndham, 786, 787.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 272; *Aug. 4*, 954. 955.
Vote for—£739,608, *Com.**, *Aug. 9*, 1647.

Consumptives
Pauper, in London, Treatment of, by Metropolitan Asylums Board, proposed.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 8*, 1357.

Contraband of War
Belligerent right to define, without reference to neutral powers—Protest against extension of articles by Japanese and Russian Governments, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. M'Arthur, Mr. Emmott; *As.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 1*, 269.
Cotton as — Declaration by Russian Government.
Q. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 1*, 269.
Food as.
British Authorities in South Africa, Correspondence, alleged, between late Boer Government and, Tabling proposed.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr Lyttelton, *Aug. 2*, 712.

Contraband of War—*cont.*
Food as—*cont.*
Russian Government's inclusion of foodstuffs, protest against.
Q. Mr. M'Arthur; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 1*, 269.

Contracts
Government Departments, Return relative to, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1332.

Cookstown, Ireland
Disturbances, Inquiry as to.
Qs. Mr. Doogan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 990, 991, *Aug. 8*, 1364.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1360, 1361.

Cooscroum, Ireland
Boat Slip, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1358.

Corbett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]
Licensing Bill, 3R, *July 29*, 125.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 776.
Bangor,
Harbour, Estimate for, Amount to be contributed by Department of Agriculture, etc., *Aug. 4*, 985.
Post Office, Additional accommodation in, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 996.
Londonderry Prison Warders—Duties, Religious denominations, etc., *Aug. 8* 1343.
Portavogie Harbour, Improvements in *Aug. 3*, 730.

Cork
Assizes—Jury Challenging at Summer Assizes, Reason for, etc.
Qs. Mr. Flynn, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *Aug. 2*, 529, 530.
Mahony, Mr. T., Land Appeal of, Reason for postponement of hearing.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 277, 278,
Port Sanitary Authority, Powers of, to make bye-laws with reference to smallpox.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 276, 277.
Queen's College.
Administration of, etc.
O. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Aug. 3*, 796.
Examinations in Arts, Distinctions gained, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 728, 729, 730.

[*cont.*

Cork—*cont.*
Show, Conveyance of horses to —Insufficiency of arrangements by Great Southern and Western Railway, alleged.
Qs. Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 532.

Corporal Punishment
Flogging in the Navy, *see under* Navy.
Sentences imposing—Return Presented, *July 29*, 79.

Cotton
Contraband of War—Declaration by Russian Government.
Q. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 1*, 269.

Cotton Industry
Machinery unguarded and unfenced, Accidents due to—Enforcing Regulations, proposed.
Os. Mr. Shackleton, *Aug. 4*, 1019; Mr. T. Taylor, 1032.
Overtime work in factories, Inadequate nature of penalties imposed for.
O. Mr. Shackleton, *Aug. 4*, 1018.
Weaving Sheds, Condition of—Failure of Employers to comply with Home Office Regulations.
O. Mr. Shackleton, *Aug.4*, 1016-1018.

County Boroughs
Schemes for creation of—Local Government Board's powers to award costs.
Q. Mr. Duncan; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 516.

County Councils
Medical Officers of Health, Number employed, Terms of Appointment, etc.—Return Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1331.

County Courts
Roscommon and Leitrim—Amalgamation of duties in connection with judgeship, proposed.
Q. Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1362.
Staffordshire—Order of the Lord Chancellor that the Registrar, George Walton Walker, shall not practice as a Solicitor, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1333.

County Courts Bill
l. Rep., *July 29*, 75.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 250.
c. 1R.* *Aug.* 2, 541.
Debate on Report (Lords), *July 29*, 75.
City of London Court, Jurisdiction of, under the Act, 76.
Deputy High Bailiffs, Appointment of, Regulations as to, 76.
Imprisonment in cases of Assault or Obstruction of Bailiff in the Execution of his duties, 76.

County Courts Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Report—*cont.*
Plaintiffs' Option of bringing Actions in County Court or in High Court in certain Cases, 75.
Controversial Character of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 2*, 550; Sir A. Rollit, 560, 580; Mr. Galloway, 564; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 580.

County of Suffolk Bill
l. 2R., *Aug. 2*, 396.
Rep.* *Aug. 8*, 1287.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
Anderson, Constable — Charges against, and Dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 772, 773.
Crossgar Water Supply—Delay in bringing New Wells into use, etc., *Aug. 4*, 970.
Dungannon School, Delay in erecting, *Aug. 4*, 990.
Indian Councils Bill, 2R. *Aug. 9*, 1692.
Irish Judicature and Development Grant Bill, Controversial Character of, *Aug. 2*, 566.
Morris, John, Case of—Powers of Board of Guardians to dispose of Boy, etc., *Aug. 4*, 989
Roundstone, Display of Flags on Licensed Premises—Illegal Prohibition by Constabulary, alleged — Complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc., *Aug. 3*, 772.
Under-Secretary for Ireland, Undue interference of, in Irish Affairs, *Aug. 3*, 772-774.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
Horses, Old—Inquiry as to disposal of, in Holland, Belgium, and Germany, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 977.
St. Katherine's Hospital, Regent's Park—Reforms in Administration of Endowment, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *Aug. 4*, 999, 1000.

Crete
Jaunaris, Dr., Representations by British Government as to Extension of clemency to, proposed—Nature of offence, etc.
Qs. Capt. Ellice; *As.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 1*, 260; *Aug. 4*, 976, 977.

Crewe, Earl of
Licensing Bill.
2R. *Aug. 2*, 483-491.
Com., *Aug. 4*,867, 943; *Aug.5*,1112, 1155, 1201.
Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1296, 1310, 1315, 1319, 1320.

Crime
Incitement to, by Newspaper Articles, alleged, Action as to, proposed — Example of Old Bailey Counterfeit Coining Case, etc.
Q. Mr. T. Taylor; *A.* Mr. A Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 271.

Criminal New Trials Bill
c. 1R.* *Aug. 8*, 1379.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]
Fiscal Policy of the Country, Proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 309–315.
Licensing Bill, 3R. *July 29*, 112, 117.

Crofters
see under title Highlands and Islands of Scotland.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Consumptives, Pauper, Treatment of, by Metropolitan Asylums Board, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1357.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R. *Aug. 5*, 1279.
Licensing Bill, 3R. *July 29*, 139.

Cross, Viscount
Licensing Bill.
2R. *Aug. 2*, 436–447.
Com. Aug. 4, 903–905.

Crossgar, Ireland
Water Supply—Delay in bringing New Wells into Use, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 970, 971.

Crown Lands Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1083.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Motor Car Service for Ireland under Iveagh-Pirrie Scheme, Cost, Benefits, etc., of, *Aug. 3*, 722.

Cunard Agreement
Date of Completion of Steamers.
Os. Sir E. Grey; Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 2*, 696.
Discussion of, Granting Adequate Facilities for.
Os. Mr. Labouchere, *Aug. 2*, 657, 658, 693, 694; Mr. Runciman, 658, 682; Sir C. Dilke, 658; Mr. W. Jones, 674; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 675, 676, 678, 682; Sir E. Grey, 675, 676, 768; Mr. Lloyd-George, 679–681; Mr. W. Churchill, 683.
Os. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 3*, 735; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 735, 830, 831; Mr. Bryce, 830, 831; Mr. Norman, 831; Sir. J. Joicey, Mr. Lough, 833; Mr. McKenna, 834; Mr. G. Balfour, 836.
Os. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 8*, 1471; Mr. Mr. McKenna, 1473.
Functions of the Vessels.
Os. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 8*, 1472; Mr. Pretyman, 1474, 1476; Mr. Runciman, 1476.

Cunard Agreement—*cont.*
Money Resolution, *Com.*, *Aug. 2*, 673; Rep., *Aug. 3*, 839.
Price Paid for the Vessels in excess of the value, alleged.
O. Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 8*, 1477, 1478.
Rate of interest for Loan to the Company.
Os. Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 2*, 687; Mr. Lough, *Aug. 8*, 1471.
Terms of.
Os. Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 2*, 687–691; Mr. Pretyman, 689, 690, 694; Mr. W. Churchill, 691–693; Mr. Lloyd-George, 696–698.
Os. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 8*, 1471, 1472; Mr. McKenna, 1473; Mr. Pretyman, Mr. Caldwell, 1474; Mr. Runciman, 1475, 1477, 1478.

Cunard Agreement (Money) Bill
(*for details of Debate, see under* Cunard Agreement).
c. 1R.* *Aug. 3*, 836.
2R. *Aug. 8*, 1470.

Curragh Camp
Building Contract—Employment of Unskilled Labour, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Foster, *Aug. 8*, 1368.

Curzon, Lord
India, Departmental History of Administration of, making public, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 8*, 1342.

Cusack Estate
Sale of—Request under Section 7 of Land Act 1903.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 987.

Customs
Report of Commissioners for 1904, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1332.

Darenth
Water pumping station at—Purity of water, Liability to pollution by surface drainage, etc.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 8*, 1339, 1340.

Dartmoor
Prison Officials, Quarters of—Extension proposed.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *Aug. 9*, 1612.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Aug. 9*, 1555.

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Cheshire, Macclesfield]
Africa South.
Garrison in—Buildings, Expenditure on, *Aug. 9*, 1686.
Horses, Sale of, after the War—Prices realised, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1686.

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*cont.*

Africa, South—*cont.*

Railways taken over by the Military during the War—Price paid, Authority responsible, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1685

Judge-Advocate-General—Duties, Nature of proposed changes in, *Aug. 4*, 975.

Knox, Sir C., and other Officers, Payment of Salaries to, after disallowance by the Treasury, *Aug. 9*, 1684, 1685.

Davey, Lord

Licensing Bill.
2R. *Aug. 1*, 242-250.
Com. Aug. 5, 1112, 1124-1126, 1147, 1148, 1173, 1177, 1203.

Davies, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com. Aug. 5*, 1265.

Meat, Methods of arresting decomposition in, during transit—Effect of boracic acid treatment on consumers, etc., *Aug. 4*, 963.

De Trafford Estate Bill

Con. July 29*, 77.
3R* *Aug. 8*, 1329.
l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.*,* *Aug. 8*, 1281; *Aug. 9*, 1489.

Dean Forest Bill

l. 3R.* *July 29*, 75.
c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.*,* *Aug. 2*, 541.

Deaths

Highlands of Scotland, Number of uncertified deaths in, Insufficiency of Medical Men, etc.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1591; Mr. S. Dickson, 1594, 1595; Sir W. Foster, 1597, 1598.

Ireland—Report of Registrar-General for 1903, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Starvation, Number of Deaths from, in London—Return presented, *July 29*, 79.

Defence of the Empire.

Committee of Defence.

Control of, over successive Governments, dangers of.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *Aug 2*, 626; Sir B. Gurdon, 645; Lord G. Hamilton, *Aug. 8*, 1401.

Co-ordination of the two Services effected by.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, *Aug. 2*, 604, 605, 607; Captain Norton, 609; Mr. W. Churchill, 632; Mr. Haldane, 634.

Executive powers and authority of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 618, 619; Sir E. Grey, 623; Mr. W. Churchill, 632.

Defence of the Empire—*cont.*

Committee of Defence—*cont.*

Expenditure, control over, possibility of reducing, etc.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 2*, 626; Mr. Lough, 637, 638; Mr. C. Warner, 638; Lord G. Hamilton, *Aug. 8*, 1401.

Expenses of Staff, Supplementary Estimate for.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug 2*, 602; Sir J. Colomb, 604.

Functions of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug 2*, 619; Mr. Haldane, 634, 635; Captain Jessel, 636; Mr. C. Warner, 638-640.

Rules defining, drawing up, proposed.
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *Aug. 8*, 1401.

General Staff—Possibility of conflict of opinion with General Staff of the War Office.
O. Major Gordon, *Aug. 2*, 613, 614.

German General Staff as a Model, proposed.
Os. Major E. Gordon, *Aug. 2*, 612, 613; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 618; Capt. Jessel, 636.

History of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 2*, 614; Sir E. Grey, 627.

Permanent Nucleus, Constitution and Duties of.
Os. Major E. Gordon, *Aug. 2*, 611, 612; Mr. W. Churchill, 630.

Prime Minister as Head of.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 2*, 627, 628; Mr. W. Churchill, 631; Mr. Haldane, 634; Capt. Jessel, 635, 636; Lord G. Hamilton, *Aug. 8*, 1401.

Questions to be submitted to.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 2*, 615-617; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 619, 620; Sir E. Grey, 624.

Records, Necessity for keeping.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 2*, 617.

Secretariat.

Number of.
O. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 2*, 603.

Permanent Secretary—Information as to Salary of.
Os. Mr. Whitley, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 640; Mr. Lloyd-George, 641; Mr. W. Churchill, 641, 642, 644; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 642, 643; Mr. Labouchere, 643; Sir E. Grey, 644; Sir B. Gurdon, 645.

[*cont.*

Defence of the Empire—*cont.*
Committee of Defence—*cont.*
Secretariat—*cont.*
Treasury Minute as to, presented, *July 29*, 3, 80.
Value of, to Statesmen and the Country generally.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, *Aug. 2*, 604-608; Capt. Norton, 608-611; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 617, 622; Sir E. Grey, 622, 623; Col. Blundell, 629.
Work of, Information as to.
O. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 2*, 637, 638.
Discussion of, as a whole, importance of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 603; Sir J. Colomb, 604, 605; Sir E. Grey, 625; Mr. W. Churchill, 632.
Home Defence.
Auxiliary Forces responsible for, alleged.
O. Mr. Llewellyn, *Aug. 8*, 1423, 1424.
Committee Report as to.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*. 620.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department—Veterinary Branch.
Clerks, reply to memorial from, *Aug. 4*, 995.
Promotions, Information as to, *Aug. 8*, 1366.
Salaries of Transferred Clerks, *Aug. 8*, 1367.
Army Horses—Remounts purchased in Ireland, *Aug. 8*, 1369.
Barrow River Drainage Schemes, Government Assistance in, *Aug. 2*, 535.
Bennett Estate—Fair rent appeal of J. Dooley, Supply of Report of Court Assessor, etc., *Aug. 2*, 534.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.
Flax and Linen Industry in Ireland, Act relating to, Omission of, from Schedule, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1702.
Measures smuggled through by means of, without discussion, *Aug. 9*, 1693.
King's County Fair Rent Appeals heard on 28th April, Reason for increase in rents, etc., *Aug. 2*, 535.
Lansdowne Estate — Reinstatement of evicted tenants, *Aug. 4*, 992.
Trench, Mr. B. B., Estate of—Reinstatement of evicted tenant, *Aug. 4*, 988.
Twelve O'Clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of session—Exemption of Fridays, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 587.

Denny, Colonel J. M. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders, number of, granted from 1898-1903, time for completion, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1337.

Deputy Chairman
see under Chairman.

Deputy Speaker
see under Speaker.

Derby, Earl of
University of Liverpool Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 397.

Derry
see Londonderry.

Derwent Valley Water Board Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 1*, 162.

Development Grant, Ireland
Estimate, Revised.
Date of taking.
Q. Mr. Blake; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1377, 1378.
Presented, *Aug. 4*, 953.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, N.]
Anderson, Constable, Charges against and dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 725, 747-750.
Bangor, Portrush and Ballymoney, Post Office Business at, information as to, *Aug. 4*, 964.
Belfast
Lough, Illegal Trawling in, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 720.
Post Office.
Garfield St., Improvement in Posting arrangements of, *Aug. 3*, 731.
Increase in staff at stamp counter, *Aug. 3*, 731, 732.
Londonderry—Motor-car service under Iveagh-Pirrie scheme, Cost of, etc. *Aug. 3*, 721.
McDonnell, Sir A., appointment of, *Aug. 3*, 722.
Portadown Disturbances, result of inquiry as to, *Aug. 3*, 722.

Devonport
Dockyard, *see under* Dockyards, Naval.

Dewar, Sir T. R. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
Explosions from Gas and Electricity escapes—Number caused by leakage from telegraph and telephone wires, etc, *Aug. 9*, 1551.
Law Courts—King's Bench Division—Appointment of additional Judges, proposed, *July 29*, 81.
London County Council, Rails and engineering plant ordered by, from British and foreign firms during last three years, *Aug. 9*, 1550.
South African War Trophies—Allotment of guns, *Aug. 8*, 1345.

[*cont.*

Dewar, Sir T. R.—*cont.*

- Telephone Service—Contracts for Plant—Number of orders given to British and foreign firms respectively, *July 29*, 81.
- Wapping—Establishment of Post Office West of Wapping Bridge proposed, *July 29*, 82.

Dickson, Rt. Hon. C. S.—*Lord Advocate* [Glasgow, Bridgton]

- Highlands.
  - Deaths in, Number uncertified, In-Men, sufficiency of Medical etc., *Aug. 9*, 1594, 1595.
  - Graveyards in, neglected condition of, *Aug. 9*, 1595.
  - Medical Officers of Health, Supply of, *Aug. 9*, 1596.
- Lewis, Island of, Houses in, Insanitary condition of, *Aug. 9*, 1595.
- Medical examination of School Children, *Aug. 9*, 1595.
- Vaccination, Laws as to, enforcement of—Supply of Lymph, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1596, 1597.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]

- Aliens Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 551.
- Anthrax, increase of, among workers in Horse-hair Industry, *Aug. 4*, 1008.
- Army
  - Artillery—Provision of Quick-firing Guns, *Aug. 8*, 1431.
  - Council—Secretary of State for War—Nature of powers and duties proposed to be transferred, *July 29*, 89.
  - Expenditure, necessity for reduction in, *Aug. 2*, 615.
  - Foreign and Colonial Regiments, proposed reduction in, *Aug. 8*, 1428.
  - Re-armament — number of orders placed, *Aug. 8*, 1348, 1349.
  - Reform Proposals.
    - Decision as to, Method proposed to arrive at, *Aug. 1*, 254.
    - Financial effect of, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1426-1431.
    - War Department Orders in Council, Procedure as to, *Aug. 1*, 264.
- Bills abandoned during present Session, *Aug. 2*, 551, 552.
- Committee of Defence.
  - History of, *Aug. 2*, 614.
  - Records, necessity for keeping, *Aug. 2*, 617.
- County Courts Bill, Controversial character of, *Aug. 2*, 550.
- Cunard Agreement—Facilities for adequate discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 658.

Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W.—*cont.*

- Factories and Workshops
  - China and Earthenware Factories, Dilapidated—Powers of Inspectors to order repairs, etc., *Aug. 3*, 710.
  - "Particulars" principle, delay in extending to piece-work Trades, *Aug. 4*, 1006.
  - Women Inspectors, Inadequate number of, *Aug. 4*, 1003-1006.
- India.
  - Frontier, Defence of, Troops required for, *Aug. 8*, 1429, 1430.
  - Invasion of, possibility of, *Aug. 2*, 615, 616.
- International Labour Conference, Switzerland—Appointment of British Delegates, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1008.
- Johannesburg — Race troubles, Secret Organisation to punish Natives assaulting white People, Alleged, Inquiry as to, etc., *Aug. 1*, 267.
- Lead Poisoning, increase in, *Aug. 4*, 1007, 1008.
- Militia, Condition of—Reform Proposals, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1428, 1429.
- Navy.
  - Boilers.
    - Coal Consumption, Particulars as to, *Aug. 2*, 522.
    - Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Aug. 2*, 522.
    - Variety of Types in use—Delay in issue of Committee Report, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1057.
  - Expenditure, increase in—Possibilities of Reduction, *Aug. 4*, 1058, 1059.
  - Shipbuilding.
    - "Lord Nelson" Class of Battleships, Information as to Design of, *Aug 4*, 1057.
    - Vote for, Delay in Introduction of, *Aug. 4*, 1057.
  - Two-Power Standard, Revision of, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1058.
- Supply Business, Arrears of, *Aug. 2*, 552, 553.
- Truck Act, Breaches of, *Aug, 4*, 1007.
- Twelve O'clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of Session, *Aug. 2*, 550.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]

- Anderson, Constable, Case of, *Aug. 3*, 724.

Dillon Estate

- Sale of—Progress of Negotiations.
  - *Q.* Mr. Tully; *A* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1363.

Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir J. C. [London]

- Port of London Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 568.

[*cont.*

Divisions

Members refusing to proceed to the Lobbies and Named for Disregarding the Authority of the Chair, *Aug. 5*, 1259–1268.

Number of, in Session 1904, and Subject of Division—Return ordered, *Aug. 2*, 509; Presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.

Docks

Regulations for, Under Factory Act, Date and Period of Tabling.
Qs. Mr. Renwick; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 527, 528.

Dockyards, Naval

Devonport.

Petitions of Workers, Delay in replying to, alleged.
Q. Mr. Benn; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 29*, 87.

Wages for Unskilled Labour, Increase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Benn; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *July 29*, 87.

Welsford, W., Compensation for Injuries to—Revision of Amount proposed.
Q. Mr. Kearley; A. Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 8*, 1339.

Dogs Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1485.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]

Banks—Government Accounts, Arrangements with Bank of Ireland and Provincial Bank for keeping—Assimilating with Scotch and English systems, etc., *Aug. 4*, 979, 980.

Cork.

Assizes, Summer, Reason for Jury Challenging at, *Aug. 2*, 530.

Show, Conveyance of Horses to—Insufficiency of Arrangements by Great Southern and Western Railway, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 532.

Smallpox, Powers of Local Authorities to make Bye-laws as to, under Irish Public Health Act—Request of Cork Port Sanitary Authority, etc., *Aug. 1*, 277.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*Under Secretary for War.*

Army Council Bill.
2R. *July 29*, 71.
Com., *Aug. 4*, 841, 842, 843.
3R. *Aug. 5*, 1208.

Militia Reform Proposals, *July 29*, 50, 60, 71.

Doogan, Mr. P. C. [Tyrone, E.]

Cookstown Disturbances, Inquiry as to, *Aug. 4*, 990; *Aug. 8*, 1364.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Act relating to Flax and Linen Industry in Ireland Omission of, from the Schedule, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1705.

Doohoma, Ireland

School—Ill-treatment of Children by Schoolmaster, alleged.
Q. Colonel Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 533.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—[Kent, St. Augustine's]

Animals—Vivisection Experiments, Increase in, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 517.

Ankylostomia Infection, Prevention of, *Aug. 2*, 519.

Anthrax—Liverpool, Death of Man at—Precautions to prevent spread of disease, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 260.

Beck, Adolf, Mistaken Identity Case of—Reparation for Wrongful Imprisonment, *Aug. 3*, 720.

Children, Employment of.
Act, Administration of, *Aug. 4*, 1041, 1042.
Rules to be Submitted to Local Authorities, Progress made with, *Aug. 4*. 1041, 1042.

Clocaenog Burial Dispute—Refusal of Parish Bier by Rector, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 528; *Aug. 9*, 1549.

Common Prayer, Book of—Alterations in Punctuation in, and Omissions from New Edition, *Aug. 4*, 959.

Cotton Weaving Sheds, Ventilation of, *Aug. 4*, 1042, 1043.

Counterfeit Coins—Descriptions of Counterfeiting Process given in Newspapers, *Aug. 1*, 271; *Aug. 4*, 1045, 1046.

Docks, Regulations for, under Factory Act—Date and Period of Tabling, *Aug. 2*, 527, 528.

Dudley Temperance Meetings, Disturbances at, Police prevention of, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1212.

Factories and Workshops.
China and Earthenware Factories, Dilapidated—Powers of Inspectors to order repairs, etc., *Aug. 3*, 710.
Fire, Precautions against, *Aug. 4*, 1040.
Inspectors.
Chief Inspector, Delay in presenting Report of, Reasons for, *Aug. 4*, 1038.
Number of, Increasing, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1038, 1044.
Women Inspectors, Increase in number of, *Aug. 4*, 1039, 1040.

[*cont.*

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*cont.*
Fish-curing Industry—Conditions of labour among Women Workers, *Aug. 4*, 1045.
Horton Lunatic Asylum, Mismanagement of, alleged—Inquiry proposed, *Aug. 1*, 259.
Licensing Bill, 3R. *July 29*, 119.
Mines—Accidents in—Responsibility of Managers and Mine owners for carrying out Precautions, etc., *Aug. 2*, 519.
Patent Medicines, Restrictions on Advertisements of, proposed, *Aug.* 2, 518.
Police.
  Evidence given by—Objections to Practice—Inspector Subpœnaed in Case of Sievier *v.* Duke, *Aug. 4*, 1049.
  Hackney Carriages, Damage caused by Examination of, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1355.
  Metropolitan — Rent Allowances, Regulations as to, *Aug. 4* 981, 982.
  Station Cells, Inquiry as to management of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1548.
Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, Provisions of —Making known to Magistrates, etc., *July 29*, 86.
Prisons.
  Dartmoor—Officials, Quarters of, Extension of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1555.
  Holloway—Prisoners under Remand, Hair Cutting Regulations for, *Aug. 4*, 982, 983.
  Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, Placards to be placed in Cells, etc, *July 29*, 86.
Sievier *v.* Duke—Inspector called to give Evidence as to character of the plaintiff, *Aug. 4*, 1049.
Thames Steamers, Liquor Traffic on, Introduction of Legislation to restrict, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 254.
Truck Acts Breaches of—Necessity for Further Legislation, alleged, *Aug. 4*, 1040.
Vaccination Exemption certificates, difficulty in obtaining alleged, *Aug. 8*. 1354, 1355.
Workmen's Compensation Act, Amendment of—Committee Report, Date of Presenting, Possibility of introducing Legislation this Session, etc, *Aug. 1*, 271.

Douglas, Mr. C. M. [Lanark, N.W.]
Education (Scotland) Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 591–594.

Down Co.
Rents, Increase in, alleged.
  Qs. Mr. MacVeagh ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1364, 1365.

Dressmaking Trade
Hours of Work and Overtime—Laxity in Inspection of Workshops, Inadequate Number of Women Inspectors, etc.
  Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1005, 1006 ; Mr. J. Burns, 1023, 1024 ; Mr. Asquith, 1027, 1028.

Dromore and Dromara
District of—Payment to Petty Sessions Clerk for Committal of Lunatics.
  Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 969.

Dublin
Marlborough Street Training College—New Building, Arrangements as to.
  Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1358, 1359.
North—Case of John Morris, Powers of Board of Guardians to dispose of Boy, etc.
  Q. Mr. C. Craig ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 989, 990.
Patterson, Rev. R. D., Annoyance of, in Public Streets, etc.—Inquiry proposed.
  Os. Mr. Sloan, *Aug. 3*, 771.
Post Office Sorting Office Defalcations—Information as to Corcoran Case.
  Q. Mr. Nannetti ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 3*, 732, 733.
Trinity College—Irish Church Act, Receipts under, Particulars as to the Expenditure of.
  Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 533, 534.
University College, Educational Results achieved by.
  O. Mr. Clancy, *Aug. 3*, 789.

Dublin County.
Constabulary in South of—Arrangements as to Manning certain Police Stations, Tabling Correspondence as to, proposed.
  Q. Mr. Hayden ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 728.

Dudley.
Temperance Meetings, Disturbances at, Police prevention of, etc.
  Q. Mr. J. W. Wilson ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Aug. 5*, 1211, 1212.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
Plymouth Port Regulations, Proposed New, Ascertaining local opinion as to, *Aug. 4*, 959.

Dumbartonshire (Vale of Leven) Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Duncan Mr. J. H. [Yorks, W.R. Otley.
Local Government Board's power to award costs in schemes for creation of County Boroughs and alteration of Local Government Boundaries, *Aug. 2*, 516.

Dunfermline District Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Dungannon
School, Delay in erection of.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 990.

Dunraven, Lord, Limerick Estate of
Sale of, Information as to.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 729.

Durham, Lord Bishop of
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 451, 457.

Durness
Poor Law Medical Officer, dismissal of, by Parish Council—Expenses of reinstatement, protection of medical officers, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 1*, 258; *Aug. 3*, 709, 710.

Durning-Lawrence, Sir E. [Cornwall, Truro]
South African War Memorial, erection of, at Eastern end of Mall extension, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 714.

Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Ecclesiastical Disorders
Committee Report, Date of presenting.
Qs. Mr. A. Taylor, Dr. Hutchinson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 281.

Edgeworthstown
Loan Fund Society Frauds, Government action as to.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *Aug. 4*, 997.
Post Office Assistant, retiring allowance to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 2*, 515.

Edinburgh
Manufactures, Board of.
Constitution and work of—Inquiry into, proposed.
O. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell, *Aug. 9*, 1568-1570; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1571, 1572, 1590; Mr. Ure, 1578, 1579; Mr. Bryce, 1583, 1584.
Sum of £2,000 misapplied by—Replacing on the Consolidated Fund, proposed.
Os. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell; *Aug. 9*, 1569, 1570; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1573; Mr. Wallace, 1585; Mr. Caldwell, 1588.

Edinburgh—*cont.*
National Art and Portrait Galleries in.
Administration of—Report of Committee of Inquiry.
Os. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell, *Aug. 9*, 1568; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1571, 1577; Mr. Ure, 1578.
Curators, increase in Salaries of, proposed.
Os. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell; *Aug. 9*, 1569; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1572.
Fees charged in.
O. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1589.
Purchase of Pictures, Grants-in-aid of.
Os. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell, *Aug. 9*, 1570; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1571, 1572.
Salaries, meeting, out of Parliamentary Grant.
O. Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 9*, 1574.
Sites for, steps taken to deal with question of.
Os. Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 9*, 1574, 1577; Mr. Ure, 1580; Mr. Bryce, 1584; Mr. Wallace, 1586, 1587; Mr. Caldwell, 1588; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1590.
Upkeep of, State Contributions towards.
Os. Mr. Ure, *Aug. 9*, 1579, 1580; Mr. Wylie, 1581, 1582; Mr. Bryce, 1582, 1583; Mr. Boland, 1587; Mr. Weir, 1589; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1590.
Royal Institution, Increased accommodation for, proposed.
O Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 9*, 1575, 1576.

Edinburgh and District Water Order Confirmation Bill
*c. Con.** *Aug. 2*, 507.
3R.* *Aug. 3*, 705.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 4*, 838.
3R.* *Aug. 9*, 1489.

Education
Carnarvonshire National Schools—Variations sanctioned as to foundation managers.
Q. Mr. Kenyon; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 9*, 1553.
Cookery, hygiene, and domestic economy, Instruction in, Physical Deterioration Committee's Recommendations as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 4*, 985.
Elementary—Cost of, and percentage borne by local and Imperial funds from 1899-1902.
Q. Mr. Wharton; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 4*, 960.

[*cont.*

Education—*cont.*

Grants—General Aid Grant Scotland, Utilisation of balance of.
Q. Mr. M. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 5*, 1215, 1216.

Ireland.

Doohoma, Illtreatment of children at, by schoolmaster, alleged.
Q. Col. Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 533.

Dungannon School, delay in erecting.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 990.

Irish Language—St. Luke, National Schools of, Cork—Inquiry as to examinations.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1360.

National School Teachers, *see that title.*

Training Colleges.
Marlborough Street, Dublin—Arrangements as to new Building.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1358, 1359.

Number of, Number of King's Scholars, etc.—Return ordered, *Aug. 9*, 1547.

University Education.

Facilities for—Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, Pledges of the Government, etc.
Qs. Mr. Clancy, *Aug. 3*, 789, 790; Mr. Gordon, 792–795; Mr. Hemphill, 801; Mr. Wyndham, 803-805, 807; Mr. J. Redmond, 805–807.

Roman Catholic University, establishment of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Clancy, *Aug. 3*, 789–792; Mr. S. MacNeill, 795, 797; Col. Nolan, 797; Mr. Wolff, 798, 799; Mr. Hemphill, 799–802; Mr. Wyndham, 802.

Religious instruction.

Denominational instruction, deduction from teachers' salaries for time spent in—West Riding of Yorkshire County Council's resolution.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 8*, 1338.

Parents, right of, to nominate instructor.
Q. Mr. Slack; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 8*, 1338, 1339.

Education—*cont.*

Schools.

Carnarvonshire National schools—Variations sanctioned as to foundation managers.
Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 9*, 1553.

Dungannon, at, delay in erecting.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 990.

Hatfield — Inclusion of rooms for technical instruction in new school, Powers of local authority, etc.
Q. Mr. Corrie Grant; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 29*, 85.

Scotland.

General Aid Grant, utilisation of balance of.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. G. Murray, *Aug. 5*, 1215, 1216.

Medical examination of Children with a view to providing better treatment and nourishment—Carrying out recommendations of Physical Deterioration Committee.
Qs. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592, 1593; Mr. S. Dickson, 1595.

Report on Secondary and Technical Education for 1904, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Secondary and Technical—Scotland—Report for 1904, presented, *Aug, 8*, 1285, 1331.

Teachers.

Agreement—Application of Article 15 of Code of 1904.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 3*, 713.

National School Teachers, Ireland, *see that title.*

Salaries, Denominational religious teaching, deduction of time spent in—West Riding of Yorkshire County Council's resolution.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 8*, 1338.

Training Colleges, Ireland.

Marlborough Street, Dublin—New Building, arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1358, 1359.

Number of—Number of King's Scholars, etc.—Return ordered, *Aug. 9*, 1547.

Education, Board of
President—Marquess of Londonderry.
Parliamentary Secretary—Sir W. R. Anson.

Education Department, Scotland
Vice-President of Council—Mr. A. Graham-Murray.
Secretary—Sir Henry Craik.

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill
c. *Com. Aug. 5*, 1220.
Rep.* *Aug. 5*, 1269.
Debate in Committee (Commons) *Aug. 5*, 1220.
Act of 1902, alleged failure of, 1237, 1238, 1240, 1241, 1243, 1245, 1247.
Clause 1.
Drafting of, power of the Chair to alter, 1221–1223.
Inclusion of three totally different matters in one clause, objections to, 1220, 1222–1231.
Postponement of, proposed, 1220, 1221.
Sub-section 1, omission of, proposed, 1223.
Closure of, without discussion of Amendments, etc., 1259–1265.
Division—Refusal of Members to enter the Lobbies, 1259, 1262, 1264, 1265.
Injustice inflicted on Children and Teachers by action of the Welsh County Councils, 1238, 1246, 1248, 1250.
Marginal Notes, Alteration of, proposed, 1223.
Members named for disregarding the Authority of the Chair, and requested to leave the House, 1265–1268.
Motion to report Progress, 1222.
Parliamentary Grants.
Deductions from Powers conferred on Board of Education with regard to, 1226–1228, 1230, 1241, 1244, 1248, 1249, 1251.
Meaning of term, 1227, 1229.
Public Inquiry into circumstances prior to condemnation of Local Authorities, proposed, 1235–1239, 1241–1254.
Clause 1, division of, into three clauses—Instruction to Committee not in Order.
Os. Mr. J. W. Lowther, Mr. Soares, *Aug. 5*, 1219, 1220.
Date of taking, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1377.
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 9*, 1567.
Reasons for forcing through, this Session.
O. Mr. Lloyd George, *Aug. 2*, 562, 563.

Education (Scotland) Bill
Abandonment of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 545; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 548, 549; Mr. Buchanan, 556, 557; Mr. Bryce, 567; Mr. C. Douglas, 591–594.
c. Order for Committee read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1487.

Edwards, Mr. F. [Radnor]
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1229.

Egypt
Anglo-French Agreement, *see* France—Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain.
Army.
Augmentation of, by appointment of British Officers, alleged.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 3*, 712, 713.
Contribution towards Increase in, proposed.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1404; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1466.
Civil Service, Regulations for entering.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 976.
Crime in, Inquiry as to growth of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy *Aug. 8*, 1352.
Finance.
Caisse de la Dette, period for termination of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 3*, 718.
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 9*, 1560.
Mecca Pilgrims, arrangements made for safety of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 3*, 718.
Nile, Basin of Upper, Despatch enclosing Report on, by Sir W. Garstin, presented, *Aug 3*, 706; *Aug. 4*, 839.
Orphans and Destitute Poor, Care of, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 5*, 1213.

Electric Lighting (London) Bill
l. 2R. *Aug. 2*, 397.
Rep.* *Aug. 4*, 840.
Com. and Rep.* *Aug 4*, 1095.
3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1328.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders
Number granted from 1898–1903, time for completion, etc.
Q. Col. Denny; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *Aug 8*, 1337.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. Rep.* *Aug. 3*, 705.
*Con.** *Aug. 4*, 951.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1210.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 3) Bill
c. Rep.* *Aug. 4*, 951.
Con. and 3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1210.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
c Rep.* *Aug. 3,* 705.
3R.* *Aug. 4,* 951.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 6) Bill.
c. Rep.* *Aug. 3,* 705.
3R.* *Aug. 4,* 951.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.
l. Com. and Rep.* *Aug. 4,* 838.
Report from Select Committee, *Aug 2,* 393.
3R.* *Aug. 5,* 1085.

Electrical Trades
Home Office Regulations, laxity in enforcing.
O. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4,* 1012, 1013.

Ellenborough, Lord
Navy—Shipbuilding—Type of ship, construction of small heavily armed Battleships, proposed, *Aug. 9,* 1525, 1526.

Elibank, Master of [Edinburgh, Midlothian]
Scottish Estimates, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug. 1,* 283.

Ellice, Capt. E. C. [St. Andrews Burghs]
Crete—Case of Dr. Jaunaris—Nature of offence, representations by British Government as to extension of clemency, etc., *Aug 1,* 260; *Aug 4,* 976, 977.

Elliot, Hon. A. R. D. [Durham]
Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1,* 315–320.

Ely, Marquess of, Estates of
Sale of—Progress of Negotiations.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4,* 969, 970.

Emly, Lord
National School Teachers, Ireland—Assistant, Average school attendance required for appointment of, Provision for reduction in, etc., *Aug. 8,* 1325, 1327.
Workhouse Inspectors, Ireland—Female Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, *Aug. 8,* 1327.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
Congo Free State—Ill-treatment of Boma natives—Case of M. de Tiège, *Aug. 4,* 975.
Cotton as Contraband of War—Declaration by Russian Government, etc., *Aug. 1,* 269.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com., Aug. 5,* 1244, 1263, 1264, 1268.

Emmott, Mr. A.—*cont.*
Fiscal Policy of the country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1,* 320–327.
Retaliation and preferential tariff proposals—Returns proposed shewing probable effect on trade of the United Kingdom, *Aug. 4,* 983.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5,* 1280.

Employment of Children
see under Children.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
Milford, Disturbances at, Police arrangements, etc.—Inquiry proposed, *Aug. 4,* 955.

Evictions, Ireland
Ballymacrossin, Estate of Major Fox—Reinstatement of Miss Masterson.
Q. Mr. H. Burke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4,* 991, 992.
Kerry—Land Commission evictions—Compassionate payment to tenants by Congested Districts Board.
Q. Col. Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2,* 532, 533.
King-Harman Estate.
Armstrong, R., Reinstatement of.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2,* 530, 531.
Fox, P., Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Blake; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3,* 723, 724.
Kingston Estate — Applications for reinstatement.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham: *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 9,* 1564.
Lansdowne Estate, reinstatement of tenants on.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4,* 992.
Limerick — Applications for reinstatement received from Hartigan and D. M'Carthy.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3,* 723.
Marshall Estate — Applications for reinstatement received.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8,* 1360.
Mohill—Application from J. Maguire for reinstatement.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1,* 275.
Return for quarter ended 30th June, 1904, presented, *Aug. 4,* 839, 954.
Trench, Mr. B. B., Estate of—Reinstatement of Mrs. Kennedy.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4,* 988.

Exchequer Bonds

Issue of—Effect on price of Consols, etc.
Q. Mr. Bright; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 5*, 1216.

Treasury Borrowings by means of. Committee to authorise.
Motion (Mr. A. Chamberlain) *Aug. 1*, 284.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 2*, 649,-651, 663, 664; Mr. Buchanan, 663; Mr. Lyell, 664; Mr. C. Warner, 664, 665; Mr. Ainsworth, 666; Mr. Toulmin, 667.
Os. Mr. Soares, *Aug. 3*,808; Mr. Whitley, 809-811; Sir M. H. Beach, 811, 812, 814; Mr. Lough, 813; Mr. McKenna, 813–815; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 815-817; Mr. W. Churchill, 817–822.
Os. Mr. C. Warner, *Aug. 8*, 1480; Mr. Whitley, Mr. S. Samuel, 1481; Mr. S. Buxton, 1482; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1482–1484; Mr. Runciman, 1484.

Expenditure

see Revenue and Expenditure.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill

c. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 284.
2R. *Aug. 4*, 1079.

Flax and Linen Industry in Ireland, Act relating to, Omission of, from the Schedule proposed.
Os. Mr. Higham, Mr. MacVeagh, *Aug. 9*. 1701; Mr. Delany, Mr. Shackleton, 1702; Mr. Wyndham, 1703; Mr. C. Grant, 1703, 1704; Mr. Doogan, 1705.

Measures smuggled through by means of, without discussion, objections to.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 4*, 1079; Mr. Whitley, 1081; Mr. S. MacNeill, 1082; Mr. MacVeagh, *Aug. 9*, 1689, 1693, 1697, 1698, 1705; Mr. Delany, 1693; Mr. Boland, 1694; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 1697.

Motion to Report Progress.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *Aug. 9*, 1693, 1698; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1693, 1694, 1705.

Explosions

Carriage of explosives on Passenger Steamers, Regulations as to, etc.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 9*, 1557, 1558.

Gas and electricity escapes—Number of explosions caused by leakage in telegraph and telephone wires.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 9*, 1551.

Exports and Imports

Colonial Import Duties, Return relating to, presented, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.

Manufactured and partly manufactured articles—Return as to Imports, proposed.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 9*, 1554.

Wheat Imported — United Kingdom, France, Germany and Italy—Comparison of duties and prices in June and July, 1904.
Qs. Dr. Shipman; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *July 29*, 84; *Aug. 8*, 1336, 1337.

Factories and Workshops

Cotton weaving sheds, Condition of—Failure of Employers to comply with Home Office Regulations.
Os. Mr. Shackleton, *Aug. 4*, 1016, 1018; Mr. A. Douglas, 1042, 1043.

Fire, Protection of workers from, Steps taken for.
Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1010; Mr. A. Douglas, 1040.

Inspectors.

Chief Inspector, Delay in presenting Report of, Reasons for.
O. Mr. A. Douglas, *Aug. 4*, 1038.

Increase in number of, Necessity for.
Os. Maj. E. Gordon, *Aug. 4*, 1035; Mr. Harwood, 1036, 1037; Mr. A. Douglas, 1038, 1044.

Women, Qualifications of—New rules suggested.
Os. Mr. Broadhurst, *Aug. 4*, 1031; Mr. A. Douglas, 1044.

Work done by, Tributes to.
Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1010; Mr. J. Burns, 1020, 1021.

Lead Poisoning in, Increase of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1007, 1008; Mr. J. Burns, 1024, 1025; Mr. Coghill, 1029, 1030.

"Particulars" principle, Delay in extending, to piece-work trades.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1006.

"Particulars" Section—Falsification and fraud by employers, punishment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Shackleton, *Aug. 4*, 1019; Mr. T. Taylor, 1032, 1033.

Physical deterioration, Effect on, of work in
Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1009, 1010; Mr. Burns, 1024, 1025.

Women.

Employment of, before and after confinement—Steps taken to enforce the law.
Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1010; Mr. J. Burns, 1024, 1025.

[*cont.*

Factories, etc.—*cont.*
  Women—*cont.*
    Inspectors
      Inadequate number of.
        Qs. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1003–1006, 1039; Mr. J. Burns, 1022; Mr. Asquith, 1026, 1027; Mr. Broadhurst, 1031; Mr. A. Douglas, 1039, 1040.
      Work done by, tributes to.
        Qs, Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1010; Mr. J. Burns, 1021; Mr. T. Taylor, 1032.
  Woollen, Worsted, and Shoddy Factories subject to inspection, etc.—Return presented, *July 29*, 80.

Fair Rents
  Appeals—Limerick, East, date of hearing appeals in.
    Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 722, 723.
  Bennett Estate, Copy of Report of Court Assessor of, supply of, to J. Dooley.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 534, 535.
  King's County appeals heard on 28th April—Reason for increase in rents.
    Qs. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 535.
  Mitchelstown—Rent of Mr P. Ahern, reason for raising.
    Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 9*, 1565.

False Statements (Companies) Bill
  c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 9*, 1706.

Farquharson, Dr. [Aberdeenshire W.]
  Animals, Humane Slaughtering of—Committee Report, measures for Adopting recommendations of, *Aug. 2*, 528, 529.
  Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill, Proceeding with, this Session, *Aug. 1*, 281.
  National Portrait Gallery, Proposals as to enlargement of, *Aug. 4*, 974.
  Parliament—House of Commons—Painting by Watts in Grand Committee Room—Condition of Picture—removal to more appropriate place, etc., *Aug. 4*, 964.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
  Ardagh burial ground, new, Loan for completion of—Decision of Local Government Board, *Aug. 1*, 277.
  Ardandra Castle, Preservation of, as ancient monument, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 961.
  Blake, Estate of late Mrs. Helen—Efforts made to trace heirs, etc., *Aug 4*, 996.
  Colehill—Gamekeeper's right to demand production of licence on public road, *Aug. 4*, 993.
  Cusack Estate, Sale of—Issue of request under Section 7 of Land Act of 1903, *Aug. 4*, 987.

Farrell, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
  Dopping Estate, Application as to sale of, *Aug. 1*, 277.
  Edgeworthstown.
    Loan Fund Society Frauds, Government Action as to, *Aug. 4*, 997
    Post Office Assistant, retiring allowance to, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 515.
  King-Harman Estate, sale of.
    Armstrong, R., Evicted Tenant, Reinstatement of, *Aug. 2*, 530, 531.
    Plant, W. H., Exclusion of, from sale, *Aug. 2*, 531.
  Rum and Black River Drainage district, Expenditure on, persons liable for, etc., *Aug. 1*, 279.
  Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 4*, 987.

Farrer, Lord
  Licensing Bill.
    2R., *Aug. 1*, 214–218
    Com. Aug. 5, 1152.
    Rep. *Aug. 8*, 1288, 1290, 1319.

Felixstowe Gas Bill
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 2*, 505.

Fellowes, Mr. A. E. [Huntingdonshire, Ramsey]
  Agriculture, Depression in—Comparison of 1874 and 1904 as to Number of Acres under Cultivation, and of 1873 and 1903 as to Rateable Value of Rural Districts, *Aug. 9*, 1563.
  Locomotives, Damage caused by Sparks from, urging Railway Companies to take Measures to prevent, proposed, *Aug. 5*, 1214.

Fenit, Ireland
  Harbour Board, Inquiry into, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1356, 1357.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
  Army Works, Wasteful Expenditure on, *Aug. 3*, 822.
  Education, Scotland—General Aid Grant, Utilisation of Balance of, *Aug. 5*, 1215.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
  Army.
    Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1433–1435.
    Three Years System—Extensions in 1904, Number of, *Aug. 4*, 958.
  Militia Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1434.
  Under Secretary for Ireland, Undue Interference of, in Irish Affairs, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 776.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]

Army Horses—Number of Remounts purchased in Ireland in 1903, *Aug. 8*, 1368.

Irish-Cured Fish, American Import Duty on, Negotiations as to Reduction of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1353.

Rowe Estate, Sale of—Vesting of Sporting Rights, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1362.

Finance Bill

l. 1R. *July 29*, 4.
2R. *July 29*, 23.
3R * *July 29*, 45.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Date of bringing before the House of Lords, inadequate opportunity for discussion, etc.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 29*, 4–7; Earl of Halsbury, 7, 8; Lord James of Hereford, 9; Earl of Camperdown, 10; Lord Coleridge, 13; Earl of Portsmouth, 14, 15; Lord Newton, 16; Marquess of Lansdowne, 17; Lord Burghclere, 19; Earl Carrington, 20–24.

Date of lapsing, alteration of, from 1st Aug. to 1st July, position of income-tax duty, etc.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth; Marquess of Lansdowne; Earl of Carrington; Earl of Selborne, *July 29*, 41.

Initiation of Bills of public interest in the Lords, proposed.
Os. Earl of Halsbury, *July 29*, 8; Lord James of Hereford, 10; Earl of Camperdown, 12.

Necessity for passing, before 1st Aug.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 29*, 6, 8; Earl of Halsbury, 8; Lord Coleridge, 14; Lord Newton, 16; Marquess of Lansdowne, 18; Earl Carrington, 20–22.

Standing Order No. XXXIX, Suspension of.
Motion [Marquess of Lansdowne], *July 29*, 4.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 29*, 5, 7; Earl of Portsmouth, 15; Lord Burghclere, 19.

Financial Secretary to the Admiralty
Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Financial Secretary to the War Office
Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney-General* [Inverness Burghs]

Education [Local Authority Default] Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1226, 1229, 1247–1249, 1251.

First Commissioner of Works
Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Earl of Selborne.

First Lord of the Treasury
Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Fiscal Policy—Free Trade v. Protection

Debate [Commons], *Aug. 1*, 284.

Albert Hall Meeting, Attendance of Ministers at terms of Resolution, etc., 319, 330, 331, 335, 336.

Chamberlain, Mr., Government attitude towards proposals of, 285, 286, 289, 292, 293, 318, 331, 332 342–344, 362, 363, 385, 386.

Colonies, preferential treatment for, proposed, 287, 295, 297, 298, 302, 303, 314, 315, 321, 327, 345–348, 351–360, 363, 378, 379.

Conference of Representatives of Colonies, proposed, 347.

Food, Taxation of, Attitude of the Government towards, 296, 300, 303, 309, 313, 327, 331, 350, 351, 364, 365.

Free Trade, definition of, 374, 375.

Government Policy, definition of, proposed, 286, 293, 294, 299, 300, 304–306, 318, 320, 322, 325, 326, 332–334, 343, 344, 363–365, 370–373, 380, 384, 385.

Liberal Unionist Association, Action of Ministers in accepting official positions in, etc., 284–287, 289–291, 293, 297–299, 304, 312, 319, 321, 348, 354, 366–370, 381–383.

Protection.

America and Germany, etc., Working of the system in, 319, 320, 329, 375, 376.

Evils of, 322.

Government attitude towards, 307–310, 317, 318, 386.

Working Classes, attitude of, towards, 327–329.

Retaliation, policy of, 307, 308, 331, 353, 355, 356.

Sheffield Policy, definition of, and attitude of the Government towards, 285, 293, 295, 299, 304.

Urgency of the Question, 291, 323, 324.

Zollverein, alleged unifying influence of, 337–339, 345, 346, 356.

Blue-book—Revised edition, proposed.
Q. Runciman; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 957.

Colonies.

Conference with Colonies, etc., proposed.
Qs. Mr. C. McArthur, Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1374, 1375.

Import Duties levied by—Return relating to, presented, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.

[*cont.*

Fiscal Policy—*cont.*

Retaliation and preferential tariff proposals—Returns proposed showing probable effect on trade of the United Kingdom.
Qs. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 983, 984.

Fish-curing Trade

Women, long hours worked by—Inspection of conditions of labour, proposed.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1004, 1005; Mr. Broadhurst, 1030, 1031; Mr. A. Douglas, 1045.

Fisheries

Ireland.
Boyne Salmon Fisheries, Close season for—Assimilation of dates in different districts, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 274.
Cashen Salmon Fishery, Inquiry as to extinction of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 994.
Cured fish, American Import duties on—negotiations as to reduction, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 8*, 1353.
Rod Anglers in North Kerry, permission for, to fish before 1st May, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 993, 994.
Scotland—Salmon and sea trout, protection of—Notice issued by Fishmongers' Company, London.
Q. Mr. Ainsworth; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 8*, 1340, 1341.
Sea—Proceedings at Annual Meeting of representatives of Authorities under Act of 1888—Report presented, *Aug. 5*, 1095.

Fitzwilliam, Earl, Estate of

Ejectment Notices, Number served, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 991.

Flannery, Sir J. F. [Yorkshire, Shipley]

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com. Aug. 5*, 1225.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]

Fisheries.
Cashen Salmon Fishery, Proposed Inquiry as to Extinction of, *Aug. 4*, 994.
Rod Anglers in North Kerry, Permission for, to fish before 1st May, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 993, 994.
Labourers' Cottages Grant, Allocation of Unissued Balances of, *Aug. 4*, 994.
Marshall Estate, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on, *Aug. 8*, 1360.

Flower, Sir E. F. S. [Bradford, W.]

Netherlands Colonial Authorities, wrongs inflicted by, upon Mr. J. Godden—Reply of Dutch Government to British Representations, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1561.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]

Cork Summer Assizes, Reason for Jury challenging at, *Aug. 2*, 529.
Fenit Harbour Board, Inquiry into, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1357.
National School Teachers—Assistant, Average School Attendance required for Appointment of, *Aug. 2*, 530.
Revenue and Expenditure, Irish Contribution to—Basis of Calculation, *Aug. 2*, 536, 537.

Food

Adulteration of, *see* Adulteration of Food and Drugs.
Contraband of War, *see that title.*
Meat, *see that title.*

Foreign Office

Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne.
Under-Secretary—Earl Percy.

Foreign Ships (Application of Statutory Powers) Bill

c. Report from Select Committee, *Aug. 2*, 541.

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derbyshire, Ilkeston]

Deaths, Number of uncertified, in the Highlands, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1598.
Medical Officers of Health, Insufficient number of, in the Highlands, *Aug. 9*, 1599.
Milk, pure, Supply of, to Poor Law outdoor relief infants, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 259.
Poor Law Unions in London and Provinces—Death Rate and Infant Mortality—Cost of Relief and ratio of pauperism to population, *Aug. 2*, 515.
Vaccination Acts, Administration of, in Scotland, use of humanised lymph, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1598, 1599.

France

Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain.
Egyptian clauses.
Egyptian opinion on, ascertaining, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy. *Aug. 8*, 1352, 1353.
European Nations, assent of, to.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 8*, 1351, 1352.
Congo—Claims of British Merchants, Interpretation of free trade clauses of Berlin Act—Progress of negotiations.
Q. Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 1*, 268, 269.

[*cont*

France—*cont.*
- Trade Reports presented, *Aug. 2*, 396; *Aug. 5*, 1095.
- Wheat—Import Duty, price, etc., in June and July, 1904.
  - *Qs.* Dr. Shipman; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 29*, 84; *Aug. 8*, 1336, 1337.

Free Church of Scotland
- *see under* Scotland.

French Congo
- *see* Congo—French.

Fuller, Mr. J. M. F. [Westbury, Wiltshire]
- Agriculture, Depression in—Comparison of 1874 and 1904, as to number of acres under cultivation, and of 1873 and 1903 as to rateable value of rural districts, *Aug. 9*, 1563.
- Porthcawl Rifle range, expenditure on, date of completion, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1349.
- Tristan d'Acunha, Island of, White inhabitants of—Progress of arrrangements for removal to Cape Colony, *Aug. 1*, 267.

Galloway, Mr. W. J. [Manchester, S. W.]
- County Courts Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 564.
- Musical Copyright Bill—Providing facilities for passing into law, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 564.

Galway
- Queen's College—Annual Report of President presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Gas
- Testing in the Metropolis—Report of Departmental Committee of Inquiry presented, *July 29*, 3, 80.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
- *c. Con.* July 29*, 78.
  - 3 R* *Aug. 2*, 507.
- *l.* Commons' Amendt., *Con.* Aug. 5*, 1086.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *Aug. 3*, 705.
  - 3R. * *Aug. 4*, 951.

Gas Orders Confimation (No. 2) Bill
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 1*, 162.

Gas Orders Confimation (No. 3) Bill
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 2*, 394.

Geneva Convention
- China, Accession of, to, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.

Germany
- Wheat—Import Duty, price, etc., in *June* and *July*, 1904.
  - *Qs.* Dr Shipman; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 29*, 84; *Aug. 8*, 1336, 1337.

Glanquin
- Constabulary force stationed at.
  - *Q.* Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 993.

Glasgow
- Post Office—Assistant Postmen, Acceleration of promotion of,
  - *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 9*, 1551.
- Workmen's trains, Improvement of, proposed
  - *Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1356.

Glasgow and South Western Railway (Darvel and Lanarkshire Railway Transfer) Order Confirmation Bill
- *c. Con.* Aug. 2*, 507.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 4*, 951
- *l.* 1R., 2R. and *Com.* Aug. 5*, 1086.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 9*, 1489.

Glasgow Corporation (Police) Order Confirmation Bill
- *c.* Lords' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 1*, 252.

Glasgow Corporation (Sewage) Order Confirmation Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *July 29*, 2.
  - 2R. and *Com.* Aug. 5*, 1086.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 9*, 1489.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways, etc.) Order Confirmation Bill
- *c. Con.* July 29*, 78.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 2*, 507.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 5*, 1086.

Glenesk, Lord
- Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1090.

Gordon, Mr. J. [Londonderry, S.]
- Anderson, Constable, Charges against and dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 775.
- Maghera—Exhibition of disloyal notices against recruiting, *Aug. 8*, 1367.
- University Education in Ireland, Facilities for, *Aug. 3*, 792–795.

Gordon, Major W. Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
- Army Finance — Recommendations of Public Accounts Committee and War Office Reconstitution Committee, *Aug. 9*, 1556.
- Committee of Defence, Constitution and functions of, *Aug. 2*, 611–614.
- Factory Inspectors, Inadequate number of, *Aug. 4*, 1035.
- Home Work, Conditions of, Sweating, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1035, 1036.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Cambridge University]
- Children, Employment of—Administration of the Act, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1013–1015.
- Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1229, 1252.

Government Departments
Contracts, Return relative to, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1332.

Government Offices
Early Closing, Uniformity of practice as to, proposed, Institution of weekly half holiday, etc.,
Q. Mr. Slack ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug.* 1, 261.
Ireland—Temporary Assistants, Pay of, deductions on joining permanent staff, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 1*, 280.

Government Ships Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1488.

Government Stock
Exchequer Bonds, Treasury borrowings on, Authorising.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 2*, 649–651, 663, 664 ; Mr. Buchanan, 663 ; Mr. Lyell, 664 ; Mr. C. Warner, 664, 665 ; Mr. Ainsworth, 666 ; Mr. Toulmin, 667.
Os. Mr. Soares, *Aug. 3*, 808 ; Mr. Whitley, 809-811 ; Sir M. H. Beach, 811, 812, 814 ; Mr. Lough, 813 ; Mr. McKenna, 813–815 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 815–817 ; Mr. W. Churchill, 817-822.
Os. Mr. C. Warner, *Aug. 8*, 1480 ; Mr. Whitley, Mr. S. Samuel, 1481 ; Mr. S. Buxton, 1482 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain 1482–1484 ; Mr. Runciman, 1484.
Unclaimed Dividends, Appropriation of, to pay off Budget deficit.
References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 41, 42.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Act relating to Flax and Linen Industry in Ireland, Omission of, from the Schedule, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1703, 1704.
Hatfield—School—Inclusion of rooms for technical instruction in new building, Powers of local authority, etc., *July 29*, 85.

Great Western Railway Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 1*, 162.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill
c. Con. July 29*, 77.
3R.* *Aug. 2*, 506.
l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.* Aug. 4*, 837.

Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
c. Con. July 29*, 78.
3R.* *Aug. 2*. 507.

Grenoble
Trade Report presented, *Aug. 2*, 596.

Greenwich Hospital
Statement of estimated Expenditure for 1904–5, approved, *Aug. 8*, 1488.

Greenwich Observatory
Report of Astronomer Royal presented, *July 29*, 3.

Gretton, Mr. J. [Derbyshire, S.]
Irish Office, Correspondence from Heads of Departments—Change in Regulations as to Address, etc., *Aug. 2*, 531.

Grey, Earl
Licensing Bill.
2R., *Aug. 1*, 219–227.
Com., *Aug. 4*, 924, 937–941 ; *Aug. 5*, 1107, 1126–1128, 1150, 1152, 1153, 1155, 1203.
Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1291–1294, 1317, 1320.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
Capital Expenditure (Money) Resolution, Objections to taking, after Twelve o'clock, *Aug. 2*, 651, 656, 657.
Committee of Defence.
Control of, over Successive Governments, Dangers of, *Aug. 2*, 626.
Discussion of Problems of Defence as a whole facilitated by Establishment of, *Aug, 2*, 625.
Executive Powers and Authority of, *Aug. 2*, 623.
Prime Minister as Head of, *Aug. 2*, 627, 628.
Secretary, Information as to, *Aug. 2*, 644.
Work of, Value of, *Aug. 2*, 622, 623.
Committee of the Empire—Expenditure, Possible Demands on, *Aug.* 2, 626.
Cunard Agreement.
Date of Completion of Steamers, *Aug. 2*, 696.
Facilities for Discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 675, 676, 678.
India—North-West Frontier, Defence of, *Aug. 2*, 623, 624.
Shop Hours Bill, Proceeding with, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 656.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1261.
Licensing Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 116, 119.
Twelve O'clock Rule, Suspension of, for Remainder of Session—Exemption of Fridays, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 585, 586.

Guest, Mr. I. C. [Plymouth]
Army Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1458–1461.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1262, 1264, 1265, 1267.
Shop Hours Bill, *con.*, *Aug. 5*, 1273.

Guiana, British
Boundary between Brazil and—Award of King of Italy with regard to, Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1095, 1211.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
Committee of Defence—Secretary, Powers and Salary of, *Aug. 2*, 645.

Hackney Carriages
Police Examination, Damage caused by, alleged.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 8*, 1355.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddington]
Committee of Defence, Re-organisation of, *Aug. 2*, 634, 635.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1237, 1239.
Navy.
Administration of, Inquiry into, by Committee of Experts, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1075.
Expenditure, Increase in—Possibilities of Reduction, *Aug. 4*, 1075.

Halifax, Viscount
Licensing Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 208–213.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor*
County Courts Bill, Rep., *July 29*, 75, 76.
Finance Bill—Date of bringing to the House of Lords, Inadequate Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 29*, 7, 8.
Licensing Bill.
2R., *Aug. 2*, 408–412.
Com., *Aug. 5*, 1118, 1126, 1148, 1171, 1176, 1177, 1193, 1194, 1201.
Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1313.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Army.
Colonial and Foreign Service Regiments, Proposed Reduction in Number of, *Aug. 8*, 1398.
Home Battalions Scheme, *Aug. 8*, 1397.
Indian, Effect on, of Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1396–1398.
Naval Fortresses, Entrusting Defence of, to the Marines, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1399, 1400.
Recruiting, Falling off in—Inducements to Recruits, etc, *Aug. 8*, 1401.
Committee of Defence, Constitution and Functions of, *Aug. 8*, 1401.

Hamilton Gas Order Confirmation Bill.
c. 3 R.* *July 29*, 78.

Hammond, Mr. J. [Carlow]
Monasterevan, Canal from, to Castlecomer projected in 1801—Expenditure of Grant-in-aid, *Aug. 1*, 263.

Harris (Scotland)
Poor Law Medical Officers, Inaccuracies in Return as to, alleged.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 5*, 1213, 1214.

Harris, Lord
Militia Reform proposals, *July 29*, 52, 60

Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1264.
Factory Inspectors, Inadequate Number of, *Aug. 4*, 1036, 1037.

Haslett, Sir J. H. [Belfast, N.]
Anderson, Constable, Charges against and Dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 787, 788.
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1624.

Hatfield
School, New—Inclusion of Rooms for Technical Instruction, Powers of Local Authorities, etc.,
Q. Mr. C. Grant; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *July 29*, 85.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
Dartmoor Prison Officials, Quarters of, Extension of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1555, 1612.
Holloway Gaol—Haircutting Regulations for Prisoners under Remand, *Aug. 4*, 982, 983.
Housing of the Working Classes Acts, Concentration of Administration of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1550.
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1610, 1613.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
Athlone—Bog in Parish of St. John's, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board—Turbary Rights of Former Tenants, *Aug. 8*, 1342.
Dublin County, South—Royal Irish Constabulary, Arrangements as to manning certain Police Stations, Tabling Correspondence as to, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 728.
Lunatic Asylums, Ireland — Assistant Medical Officers, Number of, Number married, etc., *Aug. 2*, 530.

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D. [Walsall]
Army.
Adjutant-General, Quartermaster-General and Master-General of Ordnance, Duties of, *Aug. 8*, 1406.

Hayter, Right Hon. Sir A. D.—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Africa, South, Reduction of Garrison in, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1405.
  - Auxiliary Forces—Appointment of special representative at War Office, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1406.
  - Egypt, Increased contribution from, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1404.
  - Guards, Reduction in strength of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1403.
  - Reform Proposals, Statement on—Date on which copies will be available for members, *Aug. 4*, 974.
  - Reserve, proposed changes in, *Aug. 8*, 1402, 1403.
- Committee of Defence—Secretaries, number of, *Aug. 2*, 603.
- Militia Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1405, 1406.
- Yeomanry, Expenditure on, increase in, *Aug. 8*, 1404.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
- Business of the House—Criticisms on conduct of Irish measures, *Aug. 2*, 582–585.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
- Acheen, Dutch War with—British Government representations as to cessation of hostilities and reference of dispute to Hague Peace Tribunal, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 961.
- Post Office
  - Postmarks, Illegibility of, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 711.
  - Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1619, 1623.
- Thames Barrage Scheme, Inquiry as to practicability of, proposed, *July 29*, 81.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, Lancaster]
- Business of the House, *Aug. 9*, 1705.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]
- Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 787.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 575, 576.
- Loans Fund (Ireland) Amendment Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 576, 577.
- Roman Catholic University for Ireland, need for, *Aug. 3*, 799–802.

Herault, Victor L. de l'
- Estate of, Administration of, by the Crown—Carrying out Provisions of Madame de l'Herault's will, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 986, 987.

Hereford, Lord Bishop of
- Licensing Bill.
  - 2R. *Aug. 2*, 491–496.
  - *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 868; *Aug. 5*, 1157–1162.

Hertford, County of
- Polling Districts
  - Hertford, or Eastern Division, County Council Order re-dividing, presented, *July 29*, 4, 79.
  - St. Albans, or Mid Division, County Council Order re-dividing, Presented, *July 29*, 4, 79.

Higham, Mr. [Yorks W.R. Sowerby]
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Act relating to Flax and Linen Trade of Ireland, Omission of, from Schedule, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1701.

Highlands and Islands of Scotland
- Crofters Act, Extension of, to small leaseholders, proposed
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 2*, 516, 517.
- Deaths in, Number of uncertified, Insufficiency of Medical Men, etc.
  - *Os.* Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1591; Mr. S. Dickson, 1594, 1595; Sir. W. Foster, 1597, 1598.
- Graveyards in, neglected condition of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592; Mr. S. Dickson, 1595.
- Medical Officers, Inadequate number of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592; Mr. S. Dickson, 1596; Sir W. Foster, 1599.
- Poor Law, *see that title.*
- Trawling, *see that title.*

Historical Manuscripts
- American, in Royal Institution of Great Britain, Report on, presented, *July 29*, 4, 79.
- Report of Royal Commission on, Presented, *Aug. 2*, 395, 509.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H. [Bristol, E.]
- Africa, South.
  - Garrison in—Buildings, Expenditure on, Information as to, *Aug. 9*, 1677, 1678.
  - Stores, Sale of—allegations against Col. Morgan—War Office Inquiry, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1679.
- Army.
  - Ammunition, Reserve of, Standard of, *Aug. 9*, 1679, 1680.
  - Knox, Sir C., and other Officers, Payment of Salaries to, after disallowance by the Treasury, *Aug. 9*, 1678.
  - Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1450–1455.
  - Remounts, disposal of, Prices obtained, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1679.

[*cont.*

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H.—*cont.*

Army Estimates — Surpluses on certain Votes applied to cover deficiencies on other Votes, *Aug. 9*, 1677.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Measures smuggled through by means of, without discussion, *Aug. 9*, 1697.

Public Accounts Committee Report, Criticisms on, *Aug. 9*, 1677-1680.

Holland

see Netherlands.

Holland, Sir W. H. [Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham]

Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 351–355.

Holloway Gaol

Prisoners under remand, Hair-cutting regulations for.
Qs. Mr. C. Hay, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 4*, 982, 983.

Holywood Tramways Bill

l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.** *Aug. 2*, 393.

Home Defence

see under Defence of the Empire.

Home Office

Secretary of State—Mr. A. Akers-Douglas.
Under-Secretary — Mr. T. H. A. E. Cochrane.

Functions of, Reviewing, and placing on business footing, proposed.
O. Mr. L. Sinclair, *Aug. 4*, 1050.

Inspectors, Work done by, Tributes to.
Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1010; Mr. J. Burns, 1020, 1021; Mr. T. Taylor, 1032.

Women's Department.

Understaffed condition of, inadequate number of women inspectors, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1003–1006, 1039; Mr. J. Burns, 1021, 1022; Mr. Asquith, 1026, 1027; Mr. Broadhurst, 1031; Mr. A. Douglas, 1039, 1040.

Work done by women inspectors, tributes to.
Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1010; Mr. J. Burns, 1021; Mr. T. Taylor, 1032.

Hope, Mr. J. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]

Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 361, 362.

Horse-hair Industry

Anthrax among workers, increase in number of cases—Scheduling as dangerous trade, proposed.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1008; Mr. Tennant, 1013; Mr. Asquith, 1028.

Horses

Army, *see under* Army.

Old, Disposal of, in Holland, Belgium and Germany, Inquiry as to, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Cremer; *As.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 977.

Horton

Lunatic Asylum, Mismanagement of, alleged—Inquiry proposed.
Q. Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. A Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 259.

Hoult, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Wirrall]

"Knight Commander," Sinking of, by Russian warship—Inquiry, etc., *Aug. 2*, 537.

House of Commons and House of Lords

see under Parliament.

Housing of the Working Classes

Acts, Administration of, Concentration of, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 9*, 1550.

Land compulsorily acquired and involving dishousing of Working people, Standing Orders relating to, *Aug. 9*, 1492–1494.

Owners, Register of, keeping of, by local authorities — Physical Deterioration Committee's Report and Recommendations.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 1*, 270.

Huntly, Marquess of

Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 4*, 862; Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1299, 1305.

Hutchinson, Dr. C. F. [Sussex, Rye]

Ritualistic Practices—Committee Report, Date of presenting, *Aug. 1*, 281.

Hylton, Lord

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1163.

Ilford Urban District Council Bill

c. *Con.** *Aug. 2*, 252.

3R.* *Aug. 4*, 950.

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 5*, 1085.

Imperial Committee of Defence

see under Defence of the Empire—Committee.

Imports

see Exports and Imports.

Income Tax

Increase in, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 26.

India

Secretary of State—Mr. St. John Brodrick.
Under Secretary—Earl of Hardwicke.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Accounts and Papers presented to the House during the Session referred to a Committee of the Whole House, *Aug. 8*, 1488.

Agricultural Banks, Number of, established, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug 4*, 968.

Army.

British Ridingmasters and Quartermasters, Pay of.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 3*, 714 715.

Equipments other than rifles and guns manufactured in India during last two years.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 4*, 967.

Frontier, Defence of, Troops required for.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 8*, 1429, 1430.

Imperial Cadet Corps, Members of Indian aristocracy in, Number of commissions to be conferred annually, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 9*, 1560.

Loan of troops for Imperial purposes, Saving effected by.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 9*, 1559.

Re-armament of.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 8*, 1431.

Number of orders placed.
Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8.* 1348, 1349

Reform Proposals, Effect of, on.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1395, 1461, 1462; Lord G Hamilton, 1396, 1398.

Three years system—Extensions in 1904, Number of.
Q. Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 4*, 958.

Assam, *see that title.*

Curzon, Lord, Administration of, Departmental History of Making public proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 8*, 1342.

Finance—Saving effected by loan of Indian troops for Imperial purposes.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 9*, 1559.

North-West Frontier, Defence of.
Russian invasion, Possibility of, etc.
Os. Captain Norton, *Aug. 2*, 610; Sir C. Dilke, 615, 616, 621; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 620, 621; Sir E. Grey, 623, 624.

Troops required for defence of.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 8*, 1429, 1430.

India—*cont.*

Government Departments, Salaries and distribution of work in—Return proposed
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *Aug. 8*, 1351.

Irrigation—Recommendations of Commission, Progress as to adoption of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 4*, 968.

Mails to, Contract with Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. for conveyance of—Copy ordered, *Aug. 4*, 954.

Police, Report on.

Indian Government Proposals relative to, Delay in presenting.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 4*, 967, 968.

Recommendations of, as to village police, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 2*, 520.

Railways, Administration of, Report on, for 1903, Presented, *Aug. 8.* 1285,1331.

Tibet Expedition, *see that title.*

Indian Councils Bill

c. 2R. *Aug. 9*, 1691.

Infant Mortality

Rate of—Steps taken to deal with.
Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug. 4*, 1010; Mr. J. Burns, 1024, 1025.

Inland Revenue

Report of Commissioners for 1904, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1332.

International Labour Conference, Switzerland

Subjects to be dealt with, Appointment of British Delegates, etc.
O. Sir Charles Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1008.

Ireland

Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Dudley.
Chief Secretary—Mr. George Wyndham.
Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.
Attorney-General—Mr. J. Atkinson.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Ancient Monuments, *see that title.*

Antrim, Sale of Estates of Earl of Shaftesbury in—Price asked, etc.
Q. Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1365.

Ardagh Burial Ground, New, Loan for completion of—Decision of Local Government Board.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 277.

Ardandra Castle, Preservation of, as ancient monument, proposed.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 4*, 961.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Armagh, *see that title.*

Art, Grant in aid of, Conditions of, etc.
O. Mr. Boland, *Aug. 9*, 1587.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 1*, 280, 281.

Athenry—Graig Abbey—Purchase of grazing land for enlarging uneconomic holdings, proposed.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 995.

Athlone—Bog in Parish of St. John's, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board—Turbary rights of former tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1342, 1343.

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway, *see under* Railways.

Ballymacrossin—Sale of estate of Major Fox, Reinstatement of Miss Masterson, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Burke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 991, 992.

Ballymoney, Post Office business at.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 964, 965.

Ballynahinch, *see that title.*

Bangor, *see that title.*

Banks, *see that title.*

Bann, River, Drainage of—Report presented, *Aug. 1*, 163, 253.

Barrow River, Drainage of—Government Assistance in Schemes, etc.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 2*, 535, 536.

Belfast, *see that title.*

Belfast Lough, Illegal trawling in, alleged.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 720, 721.

Bennett Estate—Fair Rent Appeal of J. Dooley, Supply of Report of Court Assessor, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 534, 535.

Beresford Estate, Proceedings as to Sale of.
Qs. Mr. Power; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 988, 989.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths—Report of Registrar-General for 1903, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Boyne River, Close season for salmon fishing in—Assimilation of dates, proposed, in different districts.
Qs. Mr. Sheehy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 274.

Burke, Isadore, Estate, Sale of—Grazing lands, particulars as to disposal of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 974.

Canal, Royal, Progress made in dredging.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 4*, 997, 998.

Ireland—*cont.*

Cashen Salmon Fishery, Inquiry as to extinction of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 994.

Children, Employment of—Bye-laws under the Act, Number of, made by local authorities, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 29*, 87, 88.

Clanmorris, Lord, Estate of, Particulars as to negotiations for sale of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 973.

Colehill—Gamekeeper's right to demand production of licence on public road.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 992, 993.

Congested Districts Board, *see that title.*

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

Cookstown disturbances, Inquiry as to.
Qs. Mr. Doogan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 990, 991; *Aug. 8*, 1364.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1360, 1361.

Cooscroum Boat Slip, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1358.

Cork, *see that title.*

County Courts, *see that title.*

Criminal and Judicial Statistics for 1903 presented, *Aug. 4*, 839, 954.

Crossgar water supply—Delay in bringing new wells into use, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 970, 971.

Curragh Camp Building Contract—Employment of unskilled labour, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1368.

Cusack Estate, Sale of—Request under Section 7 of Land Act, 1903.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 987.

Derry, *see* Londonderry.

Development Grant, *see that title.*

Dillon Estate, Sale of—Progress of negotiations.
Q. Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1363.

Doohoma School, Illtreatment of children at, by master, alleged.
Q. Colonel Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 533.

Dopping Estate, Application as to sale of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 277.

Down Co., Increase in rents in, alleged.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1364, 1365.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Dromore and Dromara District—Payments to Petty Sessions Clerk for Committal of Lunatics.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 969.

Dublin, *see that title.*

Dublin County, South—Police arrangements as to manning certain stations—Tabling correspondence, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 3, 728.

Dungannon school, Delay in erecting.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 990.

Edgeworthstown, *see that title.*

Education, *see that title.*

Ely, Marquess of, Sale of estates of—Progress of negotiations.
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 969, 970.

Estimates *see under* Civil Service Estimates.

Evictions, *see that title.*

Fair Rents, *see that title.*

Fenit Harbour Board, Inquiry into, proposed.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug.* 8, 1356, 1357.

Fish, Cured, American Import duties on—Negotiations as to reductions, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug.* 8, 1353.

Fisheries, *see that title.*

Fitzwilliam, Earl, Estate of—Number of ejectment notices served, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 991.

Flax and Linen Industry, Act relating to—Omission of, from Schedule of expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed.
Os. Mr. Higham, *Aug.* 9, 1701; Mr. Shackleton 1702; Mr. Wyndham, 1703; Mr. C. Grant, 1703 1704; Mr. Doogan, 1705.

Galway, *see that title.*

Glanquin, Constabulary Force Stationed at.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 993.

Government Offices, Temporary Assistants in, Pay of, Deductions on joining Permanent Staff, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug.* 1, 280.

Horses—Number of Army Remounts purchased in 1903, etc.
Qs. Mr. Ffrench, Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug.* 8, 1368, 1369.

Irish Language, *see that title.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Irish Society—Particulars as to Mortgages held by Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland and others.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July* 29, 86.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 1, 263.

Irishtown Post Office—Additional Delivery of Letters, proposed, and Free Delivery of Telegrams throughout Village.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 4, 966.

Kerry, *see that title.*

Kilbride Canteen Licence, Irregularity in Signing by Magistrate—Decision as to Action of Mr. Shanks.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 1, 278, 279.

King-Harman Estate, *see that title.*

King's County Fair Rent Appeals heard on Apr. 28, Reason for Increase of Rent, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 2, 535.

Kingston Estate—Applications for Reinstatement from Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 9, 1564.

Kinvara Pier and Harbour, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 1, 273.

Labourers' Cottages, *see that title.*

Lace—Counterfeit, Sale of, as real in Nice, alleged.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug.* 8, 1368.

Land Commission, *see that title.*

Land Judge's Court, *see that title.*

Land Purchase, *see that title.*

Lansdowne Estate, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on.
Q. Mr. Delany; Mr. A, Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 992.

Lavagh—Additional Postal Facilities proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 8, 1370.

Licences, Gun and Game—Gamekeeper's Right to demand Production of, on Public Road.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 992, 993.

Limerick, *see that title.*

Liquor Licensing, etc., *see that title.*

Local Government Board, *see that title.*

Londonderry, *see that title.*

Lunatics, *see that title.*

Macroom Union Clerkship, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 3, 727.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Maghera—Exhibition of disloyal notices against recruiting.
Q. Mr. Gordon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1367.

Mahony, Mr. T., Land appeal of, Reason for postponement of hearing.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 277, 278.

Marshall Estate — Applications received for reinstatement of evicted tenants.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1360.

Milford, Disturbances at, Police arrangements, etc.—Inquiry proposed.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 955.

Mitchelstown Fair Rent appeal—Reason for raising Mr. Ahern's rent, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 9*, 1565.

Mohill Evicted tenant—Application from J. Maguire for reinstatement.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 275.

Monasterevan and Castlecomer, Projected canal between, in 1801—Expenditure of grant-in-aid, etc.
Q. Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 263,

Motor-car service under Iveagh-Pirrie Scheme, Cost of, etc.—Statement to Ratepayers as to probable benefits of scheme, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 722.

Moy and Trew Station, Names and area of townlands between.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 716.

National Library—Mr. Evans, Reason for deduction from salary of.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 1*, 279, 280.

National School Teachers, *see that title.*

Neagh, Lough—Report on Drainage of, presented, *Aug. 1*, 163, 253.

Newcastle — Police testimony as to characters of prisoners, Letter written by Head Constable Smith, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 5*, 1217.

Nicholson Estate, Administration of, by Land Judge's Court — Utilisation of grazing farm for enlarging small holdings, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 275.

Official correspondence from Heads of Departments, Change in Regulations as to address, etc.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 531, 532.

Piers and Harbours, *see that title.*

Police—Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Poor Law, *see that title.*

Portadown disturbances, Result of inquiry as to.
Q. Mr. J. Delvin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 722.

Portavogie Harbour, Improvements in.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 3*, 730, 731.

Portrush, Post Office business at.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 964, 965.

Post Office, *see that title.*

Public Works.
Debt due to Commissioners, Committee to consider authorising remission of, *Aug. 8*, 1488.

Report of Commissioners for 1904, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1332.

Queen's Colleges, *see that title*; *also names of places as* Belfast, Cork, &c.

Railways, *see that title.*

Rathmines Commissioners, Appeal of, against order of Dublin County Council, Decision as to, &c.
Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 278.

Representative Peers for, *see under* Parliament, House of Lords.

Revenue and Expenditure, Amount contributed to—Basis of calculation.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 2*, 536, 537.

Roman Catholic University, Need for.
Os. Mr. Clancy, *Aug. 3*, 789–792; Mr. S. MacNeill, 795, 797; Col. Nolan, 797, 798; Mr. Wolff, 798, 799; Mr. Hemphill, 799–802; Mr. Wyndham, 802.

Roscommon and Leitrim County Court Judgeship vacancy—Amalgamation of duties, proposed.
Q. Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1362.

Roundstone—Display of flags on licensed premises, Illegal prohibition of, by Constabulary, alleged — Complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Aug. 3*, 743, 744; Mr. C. Craig, 772; Mr. Wyndham, 786, 787.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 272; *Aug. 4*, 954, 955.

Rowe Estate, Sale of—Vesting of Sporting rights.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1362.

Rum and Black River Drainage district, Expenditure on, Persons liable for, etc.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 1*, 279.

Scariff River, Examination of, with a view to Drainage, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 4*, 968, 969.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Smallpox—Powers of Local Authorities to make Bye-laws under Irish Public Health Act.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 276, 277.
Southwell, Lord, Sale of Limerick Estate of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 3, 729.
Teachers, *see title* National School Teachers.
Telegraph and Telephone Services, *see those titles.*
Thompson (Cloufin) Estate, Sale of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 4, 987.
Tireragh District, County Sligo, Petition for Construction of Railway in.
Q. Mr. W. M'Killop; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 274, 275.
Trawling, *see that title.*
Trench, Mr. B. B., Estate of—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 988.
Trinity College, *see under* Dublin.
Under-Secretary for.
Interference of, in Irish Affairs, Allegations as to.
Qs. Mr. W. Moore, *Aug. 3*, 751, 752, 758; Mr. Wyndham, 759, 770; Mr. C. Craig, 772–774; Sir J. Fergusson, 776; Mr. J. Redmond, 777.
McDonnell, Sir Antony, Reasons for Appointment of.
Qs. Col. Saunderson, *Aug. 3*, 737, 738; Mr. J. Devlin, 746; Mr. Wyndham, 785.
University Education, Facilities for—Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, Pledges of the Government, etc.
Qs. Mr. Clancy, *Aug. 3*, 789, 790; Mr. Gordon, 792–795; Mr. Hemphill, 801; Mr. Wyndham, 803–805, 807; Mr. J. Redmond, 805–807.

Irish Land Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1378.
Q. Mr. Blake; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 9*, 1567.

Irish Language
Instruction in Schools, *see title* Education *sub-heading* Ireland—Irish Language.

Irish Office
Correspondence from Heads of Departments, Change in Regulations as to Address, etc.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 531, 532.

Irish Society
Mortgages held by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and others, Particulars as to.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 29*, 86.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug.* 1, 263.

Irishtown, Ireland
Post Office—Additional Delivery of Letters proposed and Free Delivery of Telegrams throughout Village.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 5*, 966.

Isadore Burke Estate
see Burke, Isadore, Estate of.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill
c. 2R. *Aug. 5*, 1276.

Italy
Trade Reports Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286.
Wheat—Import Duty, Price, etc., in June, 1904 and July 1904.
Qs. Dr. Shipman; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 29*, 84; *Aug. 8*, 1336, 1337.

"Jackal," H.M.S.
North Sea Investigations, International, Reasons for Employment on.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 3*, 709.

James of Hereford, Lord
Finance Bill—Date of bringing to the House of Lords, Inadequate opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 29*, 9, 10.

Japan
Coal, Amount of, exported to, from Great Britain during 1904.
Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1357.
Indian Subject requested to return to India, alleged.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *Aug. 9*, 1559.
Trade Reports Presented, *July 29*, 3.
War with Russia, *see* Russo-Japanese War.

Jessel, Capt. H. M. [St. Pancras, S.]
Committee of Defence, Constitution and Functions of, *Aug. 2*, 635, 636.

Johannesburg
Race Troubles — Secret Organisation to punish Natives assaulting White People, alleged, Inquiry as to, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 1*, 267.

Joicey, Sir J. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Cunard Agreement, Facilities for Adequate Discussion of, *Aug. 3*, 833.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com., Aug. 5*, 1223, 1228, 1268.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvonshire, Arfon]
Cunard Agreement, Facilities for Adequate Discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 674.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com., Aug. 5*, 1249, 1263, 1266.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Glanquin, Constabulary Force stationed at, *Aug. 4*, 993.
Kinvara Pier and Harbour, Improvement of, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 273.
Limerick—Extra Police, Charges for, *Aug. 8*, 1365.

Judge-Advocate-General
Duties of, Information as to Proposed Changes in.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *Aug. 4*, 975.
Office of, Present Holder of—Restoration to Former Position as Parliamentary Office, etc., proposed.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug.* 2, 539.

Judges
King's Bench Division—Appointment of Additional Judges proposed.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 29*, 81.

Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland) Bill
Controversial Character of.
Os. Mr. C. Craig, *Aug. 2*, 566; Mr. Hemphill, 577; Mr. T. M. Healy, 584.
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1377.
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1487.

Justices of the Peace Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 9*, 1706.

Juvenile Smoking Bill
c. 1R.* *Aug. 4*, 1002.

Juvenile Street Trading
Evils of—Reasons for Non-enforcement of the Law.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *Aug. 4*, 1015; Mr. Crooks, 1050.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
"Blake," H.M.S., Accident on—Recognition of Heroism of Chief Stoker Gee, *Aug. 2*, 513.
Dockyard, Devonport—W. Welsford, Compensation for Injuries to—Revision of Amount proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1339.
Navy—Torpedo Boats and Destroyers—Reduction in Speed, Mistaken Policy of, *Aug. 4*, 1064-1066.

Kemp, Lt.-Col. G. [Lancashire, Heywood]
Fiscal Policy of the Country, Proposed Changes in, *Aug. 1*, 360.

Kenyon, Lord
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, *Com., Aug. 5*, 1093.

Kenyon, Mr. G. T. [Denbigh]
Carnarvonshire National Schools—Variations sanctioned as to Foundation Managers, *Aug. 9*, 1553.

Kerry
Evictions by Land Commission—Compassionate Payment to Tenants by Congested Districts Board.
Q. Colonel Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug, 2*, 532, 533.
Fishing—Reduction in Close Season to Rod Anglers, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 993, 994.

Kilbride
Canteen Licence, Irregularity in Signing, by Magistrate—Decision as to Action of Mr. Shanks.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 278, 279.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Spirits.
Bond, Removals from—Regulations as to Permits, Excise Control over Spirits after Removal, etc. *Aug. 4*, 980, 981.
Distilleries, British—Production in 1901, 1902, 1903, etc., *Aug. 1*, 260.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]
Post Office Sorter Tracers in London, Reply to Memorial from, *Aug. 3*, 711.

Kimberley, Earl of
Licensing Bill, *Com., Aug. 4*, 874.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
Indian Army—British Riding Masters and Quartermasters, Pay of, *Aug. 3*, 714.

King-Harman Estate
Sale of.
Evicted Tenants.
Armstrong, R., Reinstatement of.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug, 2*, 530, 531.
Fox, P., Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Blake; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 723, 724.
Plant, W. H., Exclusion of, from Sale.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 531.

King's College Hospital Bill
c. *Con.** *July 29*, 77.
3R.* *Aug. 2*, 506.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 4*, 837.

Kingston Estate
Evicted Tenants, Applications for Reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 9*, 1564.

Kinnaird, Lord
Licensing Bill.
2R., *Aug. 2*, 457–462.
Com., *Aug. 4*, 871.

Kintore, Earl of
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1088.
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 4*, 844.

Kinvara
Pier and Harbour, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 273.

Kirkcaldy Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
c. 3R.*, *July 29*, 78.
l. 1R.*, 2R., and *Com.**, *Aug. 1*, 162.

"Knight Commander"
Sinking of, by Russian Warship, Inquiry as to.
Q. Mr. Hoult; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 537, 538.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1373, 1374.

Knowles, Sir L. [Salford, W.]
Africa, South—Shipping Freights Conference—Date of Meeting—Terms of Reference and Method of Procedure, *Aug. 8*, 1350.
Army Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1436–1441.
Coal—Exports to Japan and Russia, Amount of, during 1904—Government Control of Export, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1357, 1376.
Lancashire Fusiliers, 1st. Battalion—Prolongation of Mediterranean Service, alleged, *July 29*, 88.
South African War, Militia, Volunteers and Yeomanry serving in—Number granted honorary Army rank, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1350.
Volunteers, Grants to, increasing, in view of Reform Proposals, *Aug 8*, 1436.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
Capital Expenditure (Money) Resolution, Objections to taking, after twelve o'clock, *Aug. 2*, 657.

Labouchere, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Committee of Defence—Secretary, Information as to Salary of, *Aug. 2*, 643.
Cunard Agreement, Facilities for adequate discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 657, 658, 693, 694.
Rhodesia, Delegation from, to discuss terms of cancelling charter of Chartered Company of South Africa—Obtaining Parliamentary Approval of Terms, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 717.
Twelve O'clock Rule, Suspension of, for Remainder of Session—Exemption of Fridays, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 588.

Labour
Children, Employment of, *see under* Children.
Factories and Workshops, *see that title.*
Home Work, Conditions of, Sweating, etc.
Os. Maj. E. Gordon, *Aug. 4*, 1035, 1036.
Hours of, Changes in—Report with Comparative Statistics for 1894–1902 presented, *July 29*, 3.
International Conference in Switzerland—Subjects to be dealt with, Appointment of British Delegates, etc.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1008.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland
Grant, allocation of unissued balances of.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 994, 995.
Loans—Rates of Interest, particulars as to.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 725, 726; *Aug. 4*. 956,
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 8*, 1369, 1370.
Occupation of, by other than *bonâ fide* labourers, prevention of—number of complaints, etc.
Q. Mr. Tully: *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 727.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill
Abandonment of.
O. Mr. Hemphill, *Aug. 2*, 575, 576.

Lagos
Wild animals and birds, protection of—Restrictions on sale of guns and powder to the natives.
Q. Sir H. Seton-Karr; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 8*, 1347.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]
Army.
Reform Proposals.
Recruiting under, Date of commencement of, *Aug. 1*, 265.
Roberts, Earl, Views of, *Aug. 1*, 256, 266.
Estimates—Increase, Automatic, Ultimate total of, *Aug. 1*, 256, 265.
Tibet Expedition—number of Tibetans killed and wounded, *Aug. 1*, 268.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
l. 3R.* *Aug. 4*, 837.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.* Aug. 9*, 1539.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Lancashire Fusiliers, 1st Battalion
Mediterranean service, Prolongation of, alleged.
Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 29*, 88.

Lancaster, Chancellor of Duchy of—*Sir W. H. Walrond.*

Land
Compulsory Acquisition of, involving dishousing of working people, Standing Orders relating to, *Aug. 9*, 1492–1494, 1542–1545.

Land Commission, Ireland
Down County, Increase in rents in, alleged.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1364, 1365.
Kerry evicted tenants, Compassionate payment to, by Congested Districts Board.
Q. Col. Saunderson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 532, 533.
Mahony, Mr. T., Appeal of, at Cork, Reason for Postponement of hearing, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien: *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 277, 278.

Land Judge's Court
Nicholson Estate, Administration of—Utilisation of grazing farm for enlarging small holdings, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 275.

Land Purchase, Ireland
Antrim, Estates of Earl of Shaftesbury in—price asked, etc.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1365.
Athenry — Graig Abbey — Purchase of Grazing land proposed.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 995.
Ballymacrossin—Estate of Major Fox.
Q. Mr. H. Burke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 991, 992.
Beresford Estate, Proceedings as to Sale of.
Qs. Mr. Power; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 988, 989.
Burke, Isadore, Estate—Grazing lands, particulars as to disposal of.
A. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 974.
Clanmorris, Lord, Estate of—Particulars as to negotiations.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 973.

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*
Cusack Estate—Issue of request under Section 7 of Land Act, 1903.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 987.
Dillon Estate—Progress of Negotiations.
Q. Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1363.
Dopping Estate, Application as to.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 277.
Dunraven, Lord, Limerick Estate of, Information as to.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 729.
Ely, Marquess of, Sale of Estates of—Progress of Negotiations.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 969, 970.
Grazing Lands, Return as to proposals for purchase of, suggested.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 972.
King-Harman Estate, Exclusion of W. H. Plant from sale of.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 531.
Rowe Estate—Vesting of Sporting rights.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1362.
Southwell, Lord, Sale of Limerick Estate of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 729.
Tenants-for-life, judicial decision as to payment of bonus to, under Section 48—Number of Sales postponed or abandoned in consequence of decision.
Q. Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 987.
Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 987.
Transactions under Act of 1903 up to 31st July, 1904, particulars as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 971.

Land Tax Commissioners' Names Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1487.

Lansdowne, Marquess of.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.*
Finance Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 28; *Com. July 29*, 41; 3R., *July 29*, 43, 44.
Date of bringing before the House of Lords, inadequate opportunity for discussion, etc., *July 29*, 17–19.
Financial position of the Country—Increase in expenditure and taxation, *July 29*, 28–30.
Licensing Bill.
2R., *Aug 2*, 496–504.
Com., Aug. 4, 920–924, 944; *Aug. 5*, 1208.
Rep., Aug. 8, 1299, 1300, 1301.

[*cont.*

Lansdowne, Marquess of *cont.*

Macedonia — Reorganisation of *Gendarmerie.*

Austrian and Russian officers, increase in number of, alleged, *Aug. 5*, 1099.

Position of affairs, information as to, *Aug.* 5. 1100.

Tea, additional 2d. per pound on, *July 29*, 30.

Lansdowne Estate

Evicted tenants, reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 992.

Laurie, Lt.-Gen., J. W. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]

Port of London Bill—Carrying over to next session, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1348.

Lavagh, Ireland

Postal facilities, increase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 8*, 1370.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]

Children, Employment of—Bye-laws under the Act, number of, made by Irish local authorities, *July 29*, 87.

Law Courts

King's Bench Division—Appointment of additional Judges proposed.,
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 29*, 81.

Lawson, Sir W. [Cornwall, Camborne]

Licensing Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 121.

Lead Poisoning

Increase in.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1007, 1008; Mr. J. Burns, 1024, 1025; Mr. Coghill, 1029, 1030.

Leeds

Post Office—Telegraph Survey Branch, filling vacancy in, etc.
Q. Mr. Barran; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 2*, 515.

Leeds Corporation (Consolidation) Bill

l. 2R.*, *Aug. 2*, 395.

Carrying over to next session, suspension of Standing Orders, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1282; *Aug. 9*, 1540.

Order of 14th March, 1904, Suspension of.
O. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Aug. 2*, 394.

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill

c. *Con.* July 29*, 77.
3R.* *Aug. 2*, 506
l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.* Aug. 4*, 837.

Leeds University Bill

c. 2R.* *July 29*, 160.
com. Rep. and 3R*. *Aug. 1*, 391.
l. 1R*. *Aug. 2*, 398.
2R., *Aug. 4*, 844.
Com. and rep.* *Aug 5*, 1095.
3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1328.

Leese, Sir J. F. [Lancashire, Accrington]

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1227.

Lerwick

Naval visit to, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 4*, 975.

Lewis, Island of

Cromore-Gravir Road, cause of delay in construction of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 4*, 957.

Houses in, Insanitary condition of, Necessity for appointment of Inspectors to deal with.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1591; Mr. S. Dickson, 1595.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flint Boroughs]

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1235.

Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *Aug. 9*, 1692.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1277.

Shop Hours Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 5*, 1271.

Surpluses on Votes, application of, to cover deficiencies on other Votes—References to, in Public Accounts Committee Report, *Aug. 9*, 1687, 1688.

Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1275.

Leyton Urban District Council Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *Aug. 1* 162.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1085.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.**, *Aug. 9*, 1539.

Licences

Ireland—Gun and Game—Gamekeeper's right to demand production of licence on public road.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 992, 993.

Licensing Bill

c. 3R, *July 29*, 90.
l. 1R.* *July 29*, 45.
Com., *Aug. 4*, 848; *Aug. 5*, 1105.
Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1287.
3R., *Aug. 9*, 1496.

Report of Amendments to have precedence of other Notices and Orders of the Day—Suspension of Standing Order XXI.
Motion (Marquess of Lansdowne), *Aug. 8*, 1287.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*

Debates on Third Reading [Commons], *July 29*, 90; *Second Reading* [Lords], *Aug. 1*, 164; *Aug. 2*, 398; *Committee, Aug. 4*, 848; *Aug. 5*, 1105; *Report, Aug. 8*, 1287; *Third Reading, Aug. 9*, 1496.

Ante-1869 Beerhouses, bringing, within the scope of the Bill, 105, 112, 113, 125, 173, 185, 186, 198, 240, 241, 447, 463, 464, 478, 479, 502, 1508, 1515, 1516.

Placing, in same position as other public-houses for all purposes, proposed, 1195–1198.

Statutory Rights possessed by, nature of, 881, 908.

Breweries, value of shares in, 403-406, 424, 495, 887.

Bruce, Mr., Bill of, in 1874, 400, 401.

Church of England, Attitude of, towards the Bill and the Licensing Question, 190, 191, 208, 228, 229, 399, 408, 412, 413, 427, 428, 1502–1504.

Circumstances of introduction and character of the Bill, 176, 177, 187, 197, 214, 472, 492, 493, 504.

Clause 4—Omission of Sub-section 4, proposed, 1152–1156.

Clergy, attitude of the Trade towards, 191, 192.

Compensation.

Basis of granting, 114, 167, 226, 227, 231, 233, 441, 476, 498, 927, 928, 940–946.

Calculation of Value of Premises "as if Act had not passed," omission of words, proposed, 131, 937, 939, 940, 942–946, 1106, 1108–1110.

City of London, Treating, as a separate Entity, 118, 1183–1187.

Definite Ratio to the Contribution made by the Licence-holder to the Compensation Fund, proposed, 1121.

Definition and Distribution of Amount to be paid to Different Persons Interested, 434, 435, 931, 934, 935.

Dormant Licences which may be called into Existence by, 429, 431, 432.

Exclusive right of Supply of Intoxicating Liquors as an Element of Value, 1114–1119.

"Expediency," Theory of, 94, 102, 103.

Fixtures, Securing Value of, to the Tenant, proposed, 1123, 1124, 1303–1305.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*

Debates—cont.

Compensation—*cont.*

Fund.

Amount to be Levied—Fixing a Higher Levy, Proposed, 1128–1131.

Borrowings by Quarter Sessions on Security of, "for a Period not Exceeding Seven or Fifteen Years, 1137–1139, 1307–1310, 1323.

Capitalisation of, Provision as to, 1516.

Inland Revenue Commissioners, Costs Incurred by, on an Appeal, to be paid out of, 1306, 1307.

Insurance Fund to be Provided by the Trade, 111, 114, 122, 125, 167, 206, 207, 238, 250, 496, 893, 1505, 1506.

Legal Expenses, Payment of, out of, proposed, 1134, 1135.

Public and not a Trade Fund, proposed, 94, 102, 103, 114, 1512, 1517.

Reduction of Licences, Degree of, possible under, 126, 167, 168, 179, 180, 231, 406, 413, 414, 419, 420, 429, 445, 462, 469, 477, 478, 497, 1129, 1131-1133, 1499, 1505, 1508, 1516, 1520, 1521.

Gladstone, Mr., and Mr. Bright, Opinions of, as to Justice of, 137, 138.

Grounds on which Magistrates could refuse Renewal of Licences without Compensation, 861, 862.

Licence Holders, Compensation to, Amount of, Minimum, 1124, 1125, 1306.

Full Term, for, proposed, 1122, 1123.

Licences taken away through no Fault of the Owner, 113, 236–238, 497.

Limited or Unlimited Levy, Discretion of Quarter Sessions as to, 127, 246.

Method of raising, 434.

Monthly Returns showing Amount of Alcoholic Liquor sold, to be made by Occupiers of Licensed Premises, proposed, 1126–1128.

Number of Reductions which could be effected by, 126, 167, 168, 179, 180, 231, 406, 413, 414, 419, 420, 429, 445, 462, 469, 477, 478, 497, 1129, 1131–1133, 1499, 1505, 1508, 1516, 1520, 1521.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Compensation—*cont.*
    - Property Value of Licences the Argument for, 94, 919.
    - Quarter Sessions, Power of, to fix Levy, or Apportion, 166, 170, 246.
    - Question as to, arising at Quarter Sessions, referring, to County Courts, or stating a case for the High Court, 1125, 1126.
    - "Right" of the Trade to, 110, 128, 134, 136, 181, 192, 199, 235, 236, 239, 245, 442, 443, 486, 487, 499, 500, 891, 892, 901, 907, 908, 915.
    - Tied Houses, Exclusion of, from Benefit, proposed, 849–859.
      - Tenants of, Position of, 130, 182.
    - Time limit.
      - Advantages of, and Necessity for, 95, 104, 105, 115, 135, 189, 190, 195, 196, 204, 246, 247, 407, 452, 453, 467, 468, 471, 500, 906.
      - Effect of, on the Fund, 115, 116, 117.
      - Fourteen Years' Compensation with Additional Seven Years' Security of Tenure, proposed, 194, 195, 204, 241, 416, 417, 423, 453, 468, 482, 878–880, 882, 884, 890, 892–900, 902–906, 909, 911–913, 915–924.
      - Injustice of, alleged, 171, 172, 200, 213, 240, 241, 416, 446, 479, 501, 903, 916, 917.
    - Valuation of licensed premises for purposes of—principle to be adopted, 180, 181, 925–933, 935, 936, 1112.
    - Value of licensed premises enhanced by refusal to renew—Assessment of Compensation as if the value had not been so enhanced, 1107–1114, 1291–1304.
    - Vested Interest created by, alleged, 171, 178, 182, 184, 188, 196, 203, 204, 206, 232, 245, 247, 413, 418, 444, 457, 458, 466, 491, 877, 886, 890, 905, 1500, 1511, 1512.
  - Complexity of the Licensing Law increased by, 407, 432, 433, 435.
  - Consumption of Alcoholic Liquors—Average per head of the Population, 220, 401.
  - Date of coming into force—First day of January, 1905, 1207.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Deputation representing Manchester Magistrates, refusal of Prime Minister to receive, alleged, 147, 148.
  - Discussion of, closure of, 96–99; 136, 137, 143, 144, 180, 408, 411, 412, 421, 422, 472, 484, 1497, 1498, 1519, 1520.
  - Drunkenness.
    - Decrease in, not necessarily implied in reduction of Public Houses, alleged, 189, 220, 402, 411, 423, 424, 450, 461, 904.
    - Evils of, 190, 205, 206, 228, 229, 401, 409, 436, 455–457.
    - Physical Deterioration Committee, Report of, 484, 485.
  - Enforcement of the Act, etc.—Position of Quarter Sessions, 430.
  - Former attempts at Legislation, 1497.
  - Interests of the Trade safeguarded to the exclusion of those of the Public, alleged, 491, 492, 494, 495.
  - Licences.
    - Classes of, which ought to be suppressed, 233, 234.
    - Definition of the word "Licence," 216, 217.
    - Monopoly value of existing licences.
      - Increase in, etc., 467–470.
      - Securing, to the State, proposed, 878, 879, 889, 910.
    - Municipal Boroughs with a population of over 25,000, retention of autonomous powers by, proposed, 1177–1182.
    - New.
      - Auction of, questions as to, 218, 219.
      - Conditions of granting, 173, 174, 248–250, 426, 467, 479.
      - Money derived from, to be given in relief of Local Taxation, Objections to, 1152–1156, 1317–1320.
      - Monopoly value of, to be reserved to the public 92, 188, 226, 479, 878, 879 1515.
      - No Compensation to be payable in the event of the renewal of a new licence being refused, Proposed, 1140–1143.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
Licences—*cont.*
New—*cont.*
Seven years' limit, 174, 184, 199, 248, 249, 1145–1151.
Short or long licences, powers of Magistrates to grant, 1146–1149.
Three weeks' notice to be given to Local Authority prior to granting of, proposed, 1144, 1145.
Undertaking to be required of licensee that he will not enter into a tied-house agreement, proposed, 1157–1165.
Vested interest in, created by the Bill, 108, 109, 125, 148, 153.
Reduction of.
Degree of, possible under the Compensation Fund, 126, 167, 168, 179, 180, 231, 406, 413, 414, 419, 420, 429, 445, 462, 469, 477, 478, 497, 1129, 1131–1133, 1499, 1505, 1508, 1516, 1520, 1521.
Difficulties attending, 210, 418, 475.
Drunkenness, Effect on, 189, 220, 402, 411, 423, 424, 450, 461, 904.
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, work of, 190, 191, 465, 466, 1132.
High Licences as a means to, proposed, 182, 183, 415, 900.
Refusal of.
Grounds on which licences could be refused without compensation, 861, 862.
Persons interested in, hearing, 460, 873, 874, 1288, 1289.
Renewal of.
Appeal to Quarter Sessions, provisions as to, 169, 170, 243, 464.
Consultation of Committee of Quarter Sessions with the Justices as to Reports, 169, 425.
Dual authority, difficulties likely to arise from, 92, 100, 200.
Existing licences at the end of fourteen years from passing of the Act, conditions as to renewal of, 194, 195, 204.
Existing on-licences, refusal of Quarter Sessions to renew, 1290.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
Debates—cont.
Licences—*cont.*
Renewal of—*cont.*
Expectation of, 235, 237, 239, 242–244, 247, 410, 442, 443, 461, 462, 891, 892, 910.
Initiative as to—Granting powers to Quarter Sessions to act without a reference to the justices, proposed, 863–871.
Insurance against non-renewal, possibility of, 217, 239, 425, 449, 450.
Justices appearing in support of their own recommendations, granting powers as to, proposed, 874–876, 1288, 1289, 1322.
Local Justices, transfer of Authority from, to Quarter Sessions, 92, 93, 100–102, 111, 117, 131, 132, 166, 169, 198, 203, 406, 407, 415, 425, 429, 430, 439–441, 453, 848, 849, 1498, 1510.
No Compensation to be payable in the event of the renewal of a new licence being refused, proposed, 1140–1143.
Premises "structurally unsuitable," suppression of, without compensation, 861, 862.
Number of Cases of non-renewal in which no Appeal was made, 416, 418, 430.
Personal evidence against, at Quarter Sessions, admittance of, 460.
Refreshments, "suitable," refusal to supply, at a reasonable price, as a reason for non-renewal, 1189–1194, 1325.
Restricted powers of Magistrates as to, under existing law, 165, 437, 438.
Section 20 of Act of 1902, application of, as though consideration of a report of the Justices were a case of appeal, 1135–1137.
Structural alteration, Failure to comply with order for, as a ground for non-renewal, 859, 860.
Returns by Quarter Sessions as to licences granted and refused in each year, 1310, 1311, 1324.
Temporary nature of, Annual renewal, etc., 243, 405, 409, 410, 448, 452, 475, 891, 892, 906.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Licenses—*cont.*
    - Time limit for, proposed, 479, 481, 482, 909, 914, 921.
      - Borrowing powers of the publican restricted by, 882, 883.
      - Fourteen years' compensation, with additional seven years' security of tenure, proposed, 194, 195, 204, 241, 416, 417, 423, 453, 468, 482, 878–880, 882, 884–890, 892–900, 902–906, 909, 911–913, 915–917, 919–924.
    - Transfer.
      - Definition of, 1206, 1207.
      - Old Licences transferred to new premises, Powers of Magistrates as to, 1201–1206, 1312–1316.
      - Remainder of the original term only, for, etc., 1317.
      - Trade, from, to a Trust, powers of Magistrates as to, 225–227, 403, 414, 490, 938.
    - Value of, Scottish Method of determining, 1513, 1514.
    - Value of licenced premises enhanced by refusal to renew—assessment of compensation as if the value had not been so enhanced, 1107–1114, 1291–1304.
    - Voluntary surrender of, put a stop to, 185, 186, 431.
  - Licenced premises.
    - Refreshments, provision of, at a reasonable price, 1189–1194, 1325.
    - Value of.
      - Enhancement of, by the Bill, 133, 135, 181, 207, 246, 415, 424, 465, 470, 488.
      - Increase in, enormous, of late years, 403, 404, 406, 480.
  - Licensing Committees.
    - Constitution of, 169.
      - One-half representative persons, and one half nominated persons proposed, 1165–1172, 1498.
    - Functions of, 434, 1174.
    - Procedure of, defining, 1174–1177.
    - Rules governing appointment of, to be made by Quarter Sessions and to receive the approval of Home Secretary, 1174, 1177, 1321.
  - Magistrates, Powers of, crippled by the Bill, alleged, 168, 171, 179, 198, 203, 209, 229-231, 422, 437, 439, 440, 454, 463, 464, 501-503, 1498, 1510.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates—cont.*
  - Opposition to the Bill by all classes of the Community, 120, 121, 133, 144, 147, 492, 493.
  - Postponement of Third Reading, proposed, 90, 98.
  - Pressure brought to bear on the Government by the Trade, alleged, 91, 98, 110, 118, 119, 129, 130, 133, 136, 137, 140, 142, 146, 150–152, 448, 1501.
  - Profits, Nett, realised for 1899 from public-houses in the United Kingdom, 224, 415.
  - Quarter Sessions.
    - Compensation Fund, power to fix levy, or apportion, 166, 170, 246, 1128–1131.
    - Enforcement of the Act, Local Option as to, 430.
    - Granting and renewing licenses, authority as to, transferred to, from local justices, 92, 93, 100–102, 111, 117, 131, 132, 166, 169, 198, 203, 406, 407, 415, 425, 429, 430, 439–441, 453, 848, 849, 1498, 1510.
    - Hearing of persons interested in licensed premises, powers as to, 871–873, 1288–1290.
    - Initiative as to non-renewal of licences—Granting powers to act without a reference to the justices, proposed, 863–871.
    - Judicial or Administrative Character and Functions of, 451.
  - Reforms, further, barred by the Bill, alleged, 91, 106, 107, 139, 154, 177, 218, 413, 422, 488–491, 496, 503, 894, 897, 1501, 1502.
  - Rules for carrying into effect of the Act — Powers conferred on the Home Secretary, etc., 169, 180.
  - Scotland.
    - Inapplicability of the Bill to, 1507, 1508, 1512–1514.
    - Licensing law in, 1513, 1514, 1517.
  - Sussex and Suffolk, Eastern and Western Divisions of, constituting, as separate counties for the purposes of the Act, proposed, 1199–1201.
  - Temperance interests not consulted, alleged, 121, 122, 124, 138, 140, 142, 145, 152, 154–156, 177, 212-214, 413, 414, 429, 435, 457, 458, 463, 481, 490, 492, 493, 1508.
  - Tied Houses.
    - Beer, Class of, supplied by, 141, 221, 222.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill.—*cont.*

- *Debates*—*cont.*
  - Tied Houses—*cont.*
    - Contracts betweeen Brewers and Publicans, Granting powers to Magistrates to inquire into terms of, proposed, 858.
    - Evils of the System, 209, 215, 216, 221, 222, 455, 456, 480, 849, 850, 854, 856–858, 1159–1164, 1509, 1518.
    - Exclusion of, from Compensation, proposed, 849–859.
    - Failure of the Bill to deal with, 480, 857, 858, 1509.
    - Licensing Commission Reports, terms of, 850–852.
    - Tenants of, position of, as regards compensation, 130, 180.
  - Time limit, *see under subheadings* Compensation, *and* Licences.
  - Trust System, advantages of, 214, 215, 223–225.

Liquor Licensing, etc.

- Alcoholic Beverages, Production and Consumption of, in European Countries, United States, and British Colonies—Memorandum and Statistical Tables ordered, *Aug. 3*, 707.
- Canteens, Army, *see under* Army.
- Ireland.
  - Ballynahinch, Illegal sale of liquor in, alleged.
    - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 263, 264.
  - Six day licence, Extension of, and rescinding of order, Action as to, by Government, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 715.
- Licences, Duties on, disparities in present system, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. V Cavendish, *Aug. 9*, 1562, 1563.
- Thames Steamers, Introduction of legislation to restrict liquor traffic on, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 254.

Light Railways

- *see under* Railways.

Limerick

- Dunraven, Lord, Sale of estate of.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 729.
- Evictions—Applications for reinstatement received from Hartigan and D. M'Carthy.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 723.
- Fair Rent appeals, date of hearing.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 722, 723.

Limerick—*cont.*

- Police, Charges for extra, enforcement of payment of, proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1365.
- Southwell, Lord, Sale of estate of.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 729.

Liverpool

- Anthrax, Death of Man from—Precautions to prevent spread of disease, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Macdona; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 260.

Llewellyn, Mr. E. H. [Somersetshire, N.]

- Army — Compulsory Service — Norfolk Commission Recommendations, *Aug. 8*, 1420.
- Compulsory Training of Volunteers and Militia, Cost of, etc., *Aug. 2*, 522.
- Militia, Condition of—Reform Proposals, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1420–1425.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon District.]

- Africa, South—Railways taken over by the Military during the War—Price paid, Authority responsible for, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1682.
- Army—Sir C. Knox and other Officers—Payment of Salaries to, after disallowance by the Treasury, *Aug. 9*, 1683.
- Business of the House, information as to course of, *Aug. 3*, 734.
- Capital expenditure (Money) Resolution, Objections to taking, after 12 o'clock, *Aug. 2*, 652.
- Cunard Agreement.
  - Facilities for adequate discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 679–681.
  - Terms of, *Aug. 2*, 696–698.
- Committee of Defence—Secretary, information as to Salary of, *Aug. 2*, 641.
- Education (Local Authority Default) Bill,
  - *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1223, 1225, 1226, 1229, 1245–1248, 1259–1262, 1266, 1268.
  - Reasons for forcing through, this Session, *Aug. 2*, 562, 563.
- Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 362–366.
- Port of London Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug 2*, 561.
- Public Accounts Committee Report.
  - Breaches of Regulations and unconstitutional practices revealed by, *Aug. 9*, 1682, 1683.
  - Discussion of, Opportunity for, *Aug. 1*, 283.
- Shop Hours Bill, Proceeding with, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 652.
- Transvaal — Representative Government, proposals as to, *Aug. 2*, 525.
- Valuation Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 561.

Loans Fund (Ireland) Amendment Bill
Abandonment of.
Os. Mr. Hemphill, *Aug. 2*, 576, 577; Mr. T. M. Healy, 583.

Local Authorities
Accounts, Audit of—Committee to consider Recommendations of Municipal Trading Committee.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 9*, 1549.

Local Authorities (Treasury Powers) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

Local Bills
See under Bills.

Local Government Board
President—Right Hon. W. H. Long.
Annual Reports presented, *Aug. 4*, 839, 952.
Medical Officer, Report of, presented, *Aug. 4*, 839, 952.
Powers of, to award Costs in Schemes for creation of County Boroughs and Alteration of Local Government boundaries.
Q. Mr. Duncan; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 516.

Local Government Board, Ireland
Surcharges, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Tully; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 726; *Aug. 8*, 1363.

Local Government Boundaries
Alteration of—Powers of Local Government Board to award costs.
Q. Mr. Duncan; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 516.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill
c. 3R.* *Aug. 2*, 507.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 2*, 394.
2R.* *Aug. 9*, 1495.
Suspension of Standing Order.
O. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Aug. 9*, 1495.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
l. Com. and Rep.* *July 29*, 3.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 162.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
l. Com. and Rep.* *July 29*, 3.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 162.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
l. Com. and Rep* *July 29*, 3.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 162.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill
l. Com., *Aug. 5*, 1086.
Report from Select Committee, *Aug. 4*, 837.
Rep.* *Aug. 8*, 1281.
Committee Stage—Powers of Committee to refuse Leave for Withdrawal of Clause.
Os. Duke of Northumberland, *Aug. 5*, 1086, 1090, 1092; Earl of Kintore, 1088; Lord Glenesk, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 1090; Lord Kenyon, Earl Cawdor, 1093.

Local Taxation
Account, Return relative to, Presented, *Aug. 2*, 509.
Licences, Return relative to, Presented, *Aug. 3*, 706.

Lochcarron (Ross-shire)
Water Supply, Improvement of, Progress in.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 1*. 256.

Loch Leven Water Power Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *Aug. 2*, 393.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1085.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 9*, 1539.

Locomotives
Sparks from, Damage caused by—Urging Railway Companies to take Measures to prevent Injury. proposed.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *Aug. 5*, 1214.

London, Lord Bishop of
Licensing Bill.
2R. *Aug. 2*, 412–417.
Com., *Aug. 5*, 1128, 1131.
Rep. *Aug. 8*, 1316.
3R. *Aug. 9*, 1520.

London and India Docks Company Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 3*, 705.

London County Council
Rails and Engineering Plant ordered by, from British and Foreign Firms during last three years.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 9*, 1550.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 29*, 1.
3R.* *Aug. 4*, 837.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill
l. 3R.* *Aug. 2*, 393.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 8*, 1329.

London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894
Accounts under Section 1 (7)—Return ordered, *Aug. 3*, 708; Presented, *Aug. 9*, 1546.

Londonderry
Motor Car Service, Iveagh-Pirrie Scheme for—Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 721.
Prison Warders—Duties, Religious Denominations, etc.
Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1343, 1344.

Londonderry, Marquess of—*Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education.*
Licensing Bill, 2R. *Aug. 2*, 431.
Post Office Bill, 2R. *Aug. 5*, 1105.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, S.]
Adulteration of Food and Drugs—Recommendations of Commission on Arsenical Poisoning—Expert Officer to advise on Questions of Purity of Manufactured Foods, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 712.
Animals, Humane Slaughtering of, Report as to—Measures for adopting Recommendations, *Aug. 2*, 528, 529.
Consumptives, Pauper, Treatment of, by Metropolitan Asylums Board, proposed, Aug. *8*, 1357.
County Boroughs, Schemes for Creation of, and Alteration of Local Government Boundaries, Powers of Local Government Board to award costs in, *Aug. 2*, 516.
Darenth Water Pumping Station—Purity of Water, Liability to Pollution from Surface Drainage, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1340.
Housing of the Working Classes.
Administration of Acts, Concentration of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1550.
Owners, Register of, Keeping of, by Local Authorities—Physical Deterioration Committee's Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 1*, 270.
Local Authorities, Audit of Accounts of—Committee to consider, Date of Appointment, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1549.
London County Council, Rails and Engineering Plant ordered by, from British and foreign firms during last three years, *Aug. 9*, 1550.
Meat, Decomposition of, Methods of arresting, during transit, Effect of Boracic Acid Treatment on Consumer, etc., *Aug. 4*, 963.
Milk, Pure, Supply of, to Poor Law Outdoor Relief Infants, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 260.
Physical Deterioration Committee's Report, Adoption of Recommendations of, *Aug. 1*, 270; *Aug. 3*, 720.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
Poor Law
Children—Boarding-out System—Payments to Cottagers, Revision of present arrangements for, proposed, *Aug. 5*, 1213.
Death rate and Infant Mortality in London and Provincial Unions, *Aug. 2*, 516.
Pauperism, Ratio of, to Population in London and Provincial Unions, *Aug. 2*, 516.
Paupers, Consumptive, Treatment of by Metropolitan Asylums Board, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1357.
Relief.
Cost of, per head of Population in London and Provincial Unions, *Aug. 2*, 516.
Outdoor—Supply of Pure Milk to Infants, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 260.
Working Classes—Ventilation and rearing of Children, Dissemination of information as to, recommended by Physical Deterioration Committee, *Aug. 3*, 720.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
Constabulary Royal Irish—Charges for, Extra Police—Legal Powers of Recovery, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1365, 1366.
Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *Aug. 8*, 1377.
Police, Extra Tax for, Method of Levying, in Certain Counties, *Aug. 3*, 779–783.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Mr. C. Scott Dickson.

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord Justice-General of Scotland
Lord Kinross.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Dudley.

Lord President of the Privy Council
Marquess of Londonderry.

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Salisbury.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 2*, 393.

Lothians Electric Power Bill
  l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 2*, 393.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
  Committee of Defence, Information as to work of, *Aug. 2*, 637, 638.
  Cunard Agreement.
    Discussion of, Opportunity for, *Aug. 3*, 735, 833; *Aug. 8*, 1471.
    Terms of—Rate of Interest for Loan, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1471, 1472.
  Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1229.
  Metropolitan Police—Rent Allowance, Regulation as to, *Aug. 4*, 982.
  Navy.
    Expenditure, Increase in—Possibility of Reduction, *Aug. 4*, 1069, 1071.
    Strength of—Two-Power Standard, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1069–1071.
  Parliament, Date of Prorogation of, *Aug. 8*, 1378.
  Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1605.
    Statement, Date of, *Aug. 3*, 735.
  Shop Hours Bill.
    Date of Taking, *Aug 4*, 1002; *Aug. 9*, 1567.
    Con., *Aug. 5*, 1270.
  Twelve o'clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of Session—Exemption of Fridays, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 587.
  Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug. 3*, 812, 813.

Lowther, Mr. C. N. W. [Cumberland, Eskdale]
  Fiscal Policy of the Country, Proposed Changes in, *Aug. 1*, 327–330.

Lowther Right Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees* [Cumberland, Penrith]
  Standing Orders, Alterations in, rendered necessary by transference of a Department from Board of Trade to Board of Agriculture, *Aug. 9*, 1541, 1545.

Lucas, Mr. R. J. [Portsmouth]
  Navy, Strength of—Two-Power Standard, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1067, 1068.

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill
  Proceeding with, this Session, proposed.
    Qs. Dr. Farquharson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 281, 282.
  c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

Lunatics
  Asylums.
    Broadmoor, Estimate for, *Com.** *Aug. 9*, 1646.

Lunatics—*cont.*
  Asylums—*cont.*
    Dundrum, Estimate for, *Com.**, *Aug. 9*, 1648.
    Expenditure and cost per Head of Lunatics—Return presented, *July 29*, 79.
    Horton Asylum, Alleged mismanagement of—Inquiry proposed.
      Q. Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 259.
  Ireland.
    Asylums.
      Dundrum, Estimate for, *Com.**, *Aug. 9*, 1648.
      Medical Officers, assistant, number of, number married, etc.
        Qs. Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug 2*, 530.
    Committals, charges for—Payments to petty sessions clerk for Dromore and Dromara district, etc.
      Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 969.
  Visits made, number of, and number of patients seen — Return presented, *July 29*, 4.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
  Evictions—Applications for reinstatement received from Hartigan and D. M'Carthy, *Aug 3*, 723.
  Fair Rent appeals in East Limerick, date of hearing, *Aug. 3*, 722.

Lyell, Mr. [Dorsetshire, E.]
  Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug. 2*, 664.

Lymph
  Humanised, Objections to use of, in Scotland.
    Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1593; Mr. S. Dickson, 1596; Sir W. Foster, 1598, 1599.

Lyons
  Trade Report presented, *Aug. 2*, 396.

Lytham Improvement Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Lytton, Earl of
  Licensing Bill.
    2R., *Aug. 2*, 474–483.
    Com., *Aug. 4*, 916–918; *Aug. 5*, 1113.

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Warwick and Leamington]
  Africa, South—Shipping Freights Conference—Date of Meeting, Terms of Reference and Method of Procedure, *Aug. 8*, 1350.
  Contraband of War, Food as—Correspondence between British Authorities in South Africa and late Boer Government, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 712.

[*cont.*

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*

Fiscal Policy—Action of Ministers in accepting Official Positions in the Liberal Unionist Association, etc., *Aug. 1*, 297–302.

Lagos—Wild Animals and Birds, Protection of—Restrictions on Sale of Guns and Powder to the Natives, *Aug. 8*, 1347.

New Guinea, British—Civil Servants, Service of, previous to transfer of territory to Australia, inclusion of, in computing pensions, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 265.

Rhodesia, Delegation from, to discuss terms of cancelling Charter of South African Chartered Company—Obtaining Parliamentary approval of terms, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 717.

Niger and Lake Chad Boundary Commission, Work of, Cost, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1558.

Orange River Colony, Representative Government for, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 524.

Transvaal.

British Indian subjects, trading rights of, *Aug. 9*, 1559.

Chinese Labour, Importation of.

Offices and Depôts—Authority responsible for cost of erecting Depôts, *Aug. 1*, 266, 267.

Recruiting in China, Method of—Inquiry as to statement of Rev. Arnold Forster, *Aug. 1*, 268.

Johannesburg—Race troubles, secret organisation to punish natives for assaulting white people, alleged, Inquiry as to, etc., *Aug.* 1, 267.

Tristan d'Acunha, Island of, White Inhabitants of—Progress of arrangements for removal to Cape Colony, *Aug. 1*, 268.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]

Common Prayer, Book of—alterations in and omissions from new edition, *Aug. 4*, 958.

Congo, French—Claims of British Merchants, Interpretation of free trade clauses of Berlin Acts, etc.—Progress of negotiations, *Aug. 1*, 268.

Contraband of War, Belligerent right to define, without reference to neutral Powers—Protest against extension by Japanese and Russian Governments, etc., *Aug. 1*, 269.

Fiscal Policy, Colonial Conference on, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1374.

Macdona, Mr. J. C. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]

Liverpool, Death of man from anthrax at —Precautions to prevent spread of disease, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 260.

Macedonia

Gendarmerie, Reorganisation of.

Austrian and Russian Officers, increase of, alleged—reason, etc.

Os. Lord Newton, *Aug. 5*, 1097; Earl Spencer, Marquess of Lansdowne, 1099.

Qs. Mr. Bryce; *As.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 962, 977, 978.

Position of affairs, information as to.

Os. Lord Newton, *Aug. 5*, 1098; Earl Spencer, 1099; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1100.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. (Leitrim, N.)

Antrim—Sale of estates of Earl of Shaftesbury—Price asked, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1365.

County Courts, Ireland—Roscommon and Leitrim—Amalgamation of duties connected with judgeship, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1362.

McKenna, Mr. R. (Monmouth N.)

Africa, South—Sale of Stores, irregularities in, *Aug. 9*, 1680.

Business of the House, *Aug. 9*, 1689.

Cunard Agreement.

Facilities for adequate discussion of, *Aug. 3*, 834; *Aug. 8*, 1473.

Terms of, *Aug. 8*, 1473.

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1222, 1227, 1263.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 9*, 1694.

Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *Aug. 9*, 1691.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1276.

Public Accounts Committee Report, Criticisms on, *Aug. 9*, 1680, 1681.

Shop Hours Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1272.

Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, etc., *Aug. 3*, 813–815.

McKillop Mr. W. (Sligo, N.)

Tireragh District, Co. Sligo—Petition for construction of Railway, *Aug. 1*, 274.

Transvaal—Gold Articles, prohibition of despatch of, by Parcel Post to Transvaal by Authorities, *Aug. 3*, 718.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]

Education.

Religious instruction, Deduction from teachers' salaries for time spent in—West Riding of Yorkshire County Council's resolution as to denominational teaching, *Aug. 8*, 1338.

Teachers—Agreements—Application of Article 15 of Code of 1904, *Aug. 3*, 713.

Orange River Colony, Representative Government for, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 524.

Transvaal, Representative Government for, Proposals as to, Opportunity for discussing, *Aug. 2*, 524, 525, 526.

MacNeill, Mr. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Africa, South—Stores, Military, illegal disposal of, by Col. Morgan, alleged—Investigation by War Office, *Aug. 2*, 523.
- Anderson, Constable, Case of, *Aug. 3*, 724, 725, 727.
- Beck, Adolf, Mistaken identity case of—Reparation for wrongful imprisonment, *Aug. 3*, 719.
- Cork, Queen's College—Examinations in Arts, distinctions gained, etc., *Aug. 3*, 728, 729, 730.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R, *Aug. 4*, 1082.
  - Measures smuggled through by, means of, without discussion, *Aug. 4*, 1082.
- Government Offices, Temporary assistants in—Pay, deductions on joining permanent staff, etc., *Aug. 1*, 280.
- Herault, Victor L. de l', Administration of Estate of, by the Crown, carrying out provisions of Madame de l'Herault's will, etc., *Aug. 4*, 986.
- Judge-Advocate-General.
  - Duties, proposed changes in, *Aug. 4*, 975.
  - Name of present holder of office, Restoration to former position as Parliamentary office, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 539.
- National Library—Reason for making deduction from salary of Mr. Evans, *Aug. 1*, 279.
- Navy, Flogging in, Abolition of, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 999.
- Queen's College, Cork, Administration of, *Aug. 3*, 796.
- Roman Catholic University, need for, *Aug. 3*, 795, 797.
- Transvaal, Representative Government for—Procedure, Precedent for, *Aug. 4*. 1000, 1001.
- Trinity College, Dublin—Irish Church Act, receipts under, Particulars as to expenditure of, *Aug. 2*, 533, 534.

Macroom
- Union, Clerkship of, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 727.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
- Anderson, Constable, case of, *Aug. 3*, 724, 725.
- Down Co., Increase in Rents in, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1364, 1365.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.
  - Flax and Linen Industry in Ireland, Act relating to, Omission of, from Schedule, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1701.
  - Measures smuggled through by means of, without discussion, *Aug. 9*, 1689, 1693, 1697, 1698, 1705.

MacVeagh, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Labourers' Cottages, Loans for—Rates of interest, etc., *Aug. 3*, 725; *Aug. 4*, 956; *Aug. 8*, 1369, 1370.
- Moy and Trew Station, names and area of town lands between, *Aug. 3*, 716.

Maghera, Ireland
- Recruiting in — Exhibition of disloyal notices, etc.,
  - *Q.* Mr. Gordon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1367.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace
- Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, making provisions of, known to Magistrates, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas, *July 29*, 86.

Malacca
- Detention and search of, by Russian Warship — Inquiry, protest by British Government, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1371–1373.

Mall to Charing Cross
- South African War Memorial, Erection of, at Eastern end, proposed.
  - *Q.* Sir E. Durning-Lawrence; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Aug. 3*, 714.

Malta
- Harbour, Improvement of, progress made in construction of breakwater, etc.
  - *Q.* Viscount Sidmouth; *A.* Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 5*, 1095, 1096.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill
- *c.* *Con.* July 29*, 78.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 2*, 506.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts. *Con.* Aug. 9*, 1489.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill
- *c.* *Con.* July 29*, 78.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 2*, 506.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 4*, 837.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill
- *c.* *Con.* July 29*, 78.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 2*, 506.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 4*, 837.

Marine Insurance Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1485.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]
- Ankylostomia Infection, prevention of, *Aug. 2*, 518.
- Contraband of War, Food as—alleged correspondence between British authorities in South Africa and late Boer Government, Tabling, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 712.
- Mines, Accidents in, Precautions against, Responsibility of owner and manager in carrying out, etc., *Aug. 2*. 519.

[*cont.*

Markham, Mr. A. B.—*cont.*

Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, Provisions of—Making known to Magistrates, etc., *July 29*, 86.

Rhodesia, Delegation from, to discuss terms of cancelling charter of Chartered Company of South Africa—Obtaining Parliamentary approval of terms, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 253.

Thames Steamers, Liquor Traffic on, Introduction of legislation to restrict, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 254.

Marlborough, Duke of [Parliamentary Secretary for the Colonies]

Orange River Colony, Proposals as to representative government for, *Aug. 5*, 1104.

Transvaal Administration—Proposals as to representative government, *Aug. 5*, 1103.

Marriages

Ireland—Report of Registrar-General for 1903, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1083.

Marshall Estate

Evicted tenants, applications for re-instatement received from.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1360.

Meat

Decomposition of, methods of arresting, during transit, effect of boracic acid treatment on consumer, etc.
Q. Mr. Alfred Davies; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 4*, 963.

Inspection of, Return relative to, presented, *Aug. 9*, 1546.

Mecca Pilgrims

Egyptian Government's arrangements for safety of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 3*, 718.

Medical Officers

Poor Law, *see that title.*

Medicines, Patent

Restrictions on Advertisements of, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. Chamberlayne; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 518.

Melrose District Water Order Confirmation Bill

l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Merchant Shipping

British and Foreign Ships detained as unsafe from July 1, 1903 to June 30, 1904—Return presented, *Aug. 4*, 839, 953.

British Vessels, Detention and Search of, by Russian Cruisers, *for particular vessels, see their names.*

Casualties to British and Foreign Ships from July 1, 1902 to June 30, 1903—Return presented, *Aug. 2*, 396, 510.

Casualties to Ships, Number and Nature of—Number of Deaths and Results of Inquiries, etc.—Return ordered, *Aug. 9*, 1548.

Cunard Agreement, *see that title.*

Docks—Regulations for, under Factory Act, Date and Period of Tabling.
Qs. Mr. Renwick; *As.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 527, 528.

Explosives—Regulations as to Conveyance of, on Passenger Steamers.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 9*, 1557, 1558.

Foreign Vessels plying to and from British Ports, Life-Saving Appliances carried by, Number of Vessels, etc.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 3*, 713; *Aug. 8*, 1355, 1356.

"Greyhounds" of the Mercantile Marine, Value of, as Auxiliaries of the Navy in time of War.
O. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1525.

Progress of, in United Kingdom, and principal maritime countries—Tables showing, presented, *July 29*, 80.

Seamen—Engagements of Sailors and Firemen in June and July, Proportion of British to Foreign Seamen, etc.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1334, 1335.

Squadron of Warships, Board of Trade notices as to danger in approaching.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 5*, 1215.

Metropolitan Asylums Board

Consumptives, Treatment of, by, proposed.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 8*, 1357.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill

l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Metropolitan Police

Hackney Carriages, Damage caused in inspecting, alleged.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 8*, 1355.

Rent Allowance, Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Slack, Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 4*, 981, 982.

Metropolitan Police Court

Middlesex, Jurisdiction in—Report of Departmental Committee of Inquiry, presented, *Aug. 4*, 839, 953.

Metropolitan Railways

Electric Traction, Delay in introducing, alleged.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 29*, 83, 84.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *Aug 2*, 393.
3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Middlesex

Metropolitan Police Court Jurisdiction in—Report of Departmental Committee of Inquiry, Presented, *Aug, 4*, 839, 953.

Milford, Ireland

Disturbances at, Police Arrangements, etc. Inquiry proposed.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 955.

Militia

Abolition of—War Office Proposals.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*. 1388; Sir J. Fergusson, 1434; Mr. G. Boscawen, 1447, 1448.

Advisory Board, Reason for Abolition of, etc.
O. Lord Raglan, *July 29*, 56.

Army, Militia as Recruiting Agent for, alleged.
Os. Lord Harris, *July 29*, 52; Earl of Donoughmore, 62; Lord Burghclere, 64; Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1389, 1390; Sir J. Fergusson, 1434.

Compulsory Service, *see that title.*

Condition of.
Os Mr. W Churchill, *Aug.* 8, 1416; Mr. Llewellyn, 1420, 1424; Sir C. Dilke, 1428, 1429.

Cost of, Compared with that of Volunteers and Yeomanry, etc.
O. Lord Raglan, *July 29*, 57.

Embodying, for six months in the year, with six weeks' additional training, proposed.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1389, 1391; Col. Sandys, 1456.

Enlistment, Terms of—Two Years' Service in the Battalion, and Six Years' in the Reserve, proposed.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1391.

Foreign Service, Liability for, Difficulty in Avoiding, Term of Service under new proposals, etc.
Os. Lord Harris, *July* 29, 54; Lord Burghclere, 66; Earl of Selborne, 68; Mr. G. Boscawen, *Aug. 8*, 1448, 1449.

Irish, Proposals as to—Desirability of Maintaining, etc.
Os. Earl Spencer, *July 29*, 50; Lord Raglan, 58; Earl of Donoughmore, 63.

Militia—*cont.*

Norfolk Commission Report and Recommendations—Cost of Training.
Q. Mr Llewellyn; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 2*, 522, 523.

Officers.

Abolition of Rank above Major, bad effect on class of Officers, etc.
O. Lord Raglan, *July 29*, 59; Earl of Selborne, 69.

Colonels, Consultation of, in the Autumn, proposals as to.
O. Lord Harris, *July* 29, 53.

Payment, Annual, to, proposed.
Os. Lord Raglan, *July 29*, 56; Earl of Donoughmore, 62.

Recruiting—Diminution in Numbers, Reasons for, etc.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 29*, 48; Earl of Donoughmore, 61.

Reduction in Establishment of, proposed.
O. Mr. G. Boscawen, *Aug. 8*, 1449.

Reform Proposals.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1388–1392; Sir A. Hayter, 1405, 1406; Mr. W. Churchill, 1415, 1416; Mr. Llewellyn, 1420–1425; Sir C. Dilke, 1429; Capt. Norton, 1445; Mr. G. Boscawen, 1447–1450; Col. Sandys, 1455, 1456; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1466, 1467.

Resolution (Earl of Wemyss), *July 29*, 45.

Decision as to, Method proposed to arrive at.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 254.

Regulations, Further, relating to, presented, *Aug. 4*, 839, 953.

South African War, Number serving in—Number granted honorary army rank, etc.
Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1350.

Swiss System, Advantages of.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1467.

Territorial Battalions, Formation of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1390–1392; Mr. Llewellyn, 1421.

War Office Neglect of, alleged.
Os. Lord Raglan, *July 29*, 56; Earl of Selborne, 67.

Milk

Pure Supply of, to Poor Law Outdoor Relief Infants, proposed.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 1*, 259, 260.

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill

c. Order for Third Reading Read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 951.

Mines.

Accidents in, Precautions against, Responsibility of Owner and Manager for carrying out, etc.
  Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 519.

Ankylostomia, *see that title.*

Minster, Lord

Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *Aug. 4*, 837.

Mitchelstown, Ireland

Fair Rent Appeal—Reason for raising rent of Mr. P. Ahern.
  Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 9*, 1565.

Mohill

Evicted Tenant—Application from J. Maguire for Reinstatement.
  Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A*, Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 275.

Monasterevan

Canal to connect, with Castlecomer projected in 1801—Expenditure of Grant-in-aid.
  Q. Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 263.

Monkswell, Lord

Army Council Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 843.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1133, 1182–1184.

Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, N.]

Army Reform Proposals—Finance Department, Constitution of, *July 29*, 88.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Dublin County, S.]

Rathmines Commissioners, Appeal of, against order of Dublin County Council, Decision as to, *Aug. 1*, 278.

Moore, Mr. W. [Antrim, N.]

Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and Dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 2*, 750–759.

Under Secretary for Ireland, Undue interference of, in Irish Affairs, *Aug 3*, 751, 752, 758.

Morgan, Mr. D. J. [Essex, Walthamstow]

Post Office Counter Clerks in London, Checking stocks of, *Aug. 9*, 1562.

Moss, Mr. S. [Denbighshire, E.]

Committee, Rule as to Number of times a Member may speak in, *Aug. 2*, 655.

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1221, 1223, 1230, 1264.

Twelve O'clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of Session—Exemption of Fridays, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 587.

Motor Cars

Ireland—Service under Iveagh-Pirrie scheme—Cost, etc.
  Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 721, 722.

Number registered, and Number of licences granted in 1903–4—Return presented, *July 29*, 80.

Moy and Trew Station

Townlands between—names, area, etc.
  Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 716.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Buteshire]

Chanonry Ferry, Closing of—Inconvenience to public, etc., *Aug. 1*, 257.

Congested Districts Board—Lewis, Island of—Delay in Construction of Cromore-Gravir Road, *Aug. 4*, 957.

Crofters' Act, Extension of, to small Leaseholders in Highland Crofting Counties, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 517.

Durness—Dismissal of Medical Officer by Parish Councils—Expenses of reinstatement—Protection of Medical Officers, etc., *Aug. 1*, 258; *Aug. 3*, 710.

Edinburgh.
  Manufactures, Board of.
    Constitution and Work of, *Aug. 9*, 1571, 1590.
    Sum of £2,000 misapplied by, alleged, *Aug. 9*, 1573.
  National Art and Portrait Galleries.
    Curators, Increase in Salaries of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1572.
    Purchase of Pictures, Grants in aid of, *Aug. 9*, 1571, 1572.
    Sites for, Steps taken to deal with Question of, *Aug. 9*, 1574–1577, 1590.
    State Contributions towards Upkeep of, *Aug. 9*, 1590.
  Royal Institution, Increased Accommodation for, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1575, 1576.

Education Grants—General Aid Grant, Utilisation of Balance of, *Aug. 5*, 1216.

Fisheries—Salmon and Sea Trout, Protection of—Notice issued by Fishmongers' Company, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1341.

Highlands and Islands of Scotland.
  Crofters' Act, Extension of, to Small Leaseholders, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 517.
  Poor Law Medical Officers, Government Provision for Annual Leave, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 257.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*cont.*

Harris—Parochial Medical Officers, Inaccuracies in Return as to, alleged, *Aug. 5*, 1214.

"Jackal," H.M.S., Employment of, on International North Sea Investigations, Reason for, etc., *Aug. 3*, 709.

Lewis, Island of—Delay in Construction of Cromore-Gravir Road, *Aug. 4*, 957.

Lochcarron Water Supply, Improvement of, Progress in, *Aug. 1*, 256.

Poor Law Medical Officers.

Durness Medical Officer, Dismissal of, by Parish Council—Expenses of Reinstatement — Protection of Medical Officers, etc., *Aug. 1*, 258; *Aug 3*, 710.

Leave, Annual, Government Provision for, in Remote Parishes, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 257.

Return as to, Inaccuracies in, alleged, *Aug. 5*, 1214.

Trawling, Illegal—Legislation of more deterrent nature, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 709.

Musical Copyright Bill

Providing Facilities for passing into Law, proposed.
Os. Mr. Galloway, *Aug. 2*, 564: Mr. A. J. Balfour, 579.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]

Curragh Camp Building Contract—Employment of Unskilled Labour, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1368.

Post Office.

Dublin Sorting Office Defalcations—Corcoran case, *Aug. 3*, 732.

Irish Town Sub-postmasters, Increase of Salaries alleged to be withheld from, Report on, in 1902, Receipt of, by Postmaster-General, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1370.

Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1621, 1622, 1634.

Discussion of, Opportunity for, *Aug. 3*, 735, 736; *Aug. 8*, 1375.

National Debt

Sinking Fund, Position of.
References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 35, 38.

National Portrait Gallery

Enlargement of, Proposals as to.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 974, 975.

Estimate for, *Com.*,* *Aug. 9*, 1649.

National Portrait Gallery, Scotland

See under Edinburgh.

National School Teachers, Ireland

Assistants, Average School Attendance required for Appointment of, Provision for Reduction in, etc.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 530
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 729.
Q. Lord Emly; *A.* Lord Ashbourne, *Aug. 8*, 1325, 1326, 1327.

Dismissals, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 9*, 1565.

Promotions, Number of, since end of Triennial Period, 1903, of Male Principal teachers.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 520, 521.

Reports, Regulations as to marking "Excellent" by Inspectors.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 970; *Aug. 8*, 1344.

Salaries.

Reduction owing to decrease in Attendance from cause over which Teacher had no Control—Payment of full Salary proposed.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 262.

Teacher of School, Roll No. 8145—Delay in receiving Increment, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 520.

National Telephone Company

Progress of Negotiations with, as to Purchase.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 8*, 1353.

Naval and Military Medals Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 9*, 1706.

Naval Prize Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1083.

Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

Navy

First Lord—Earl of Selborne
Financial Secretary—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Administration of, Inquiry into, by Committee of Experts, proposed.
Os. Mr. Haldane, Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 4*, 1075.

Appropriation Accounts referred to Committee, *Aug. 8*, 1488.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
  Battleships.
    Cost of, Increase in.
      O. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1523.
    "Lord Nelson" Class, Information as to Design of.
      Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1057; Mr. Pretyman, 1063; Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1531.
    Small Type of Heavily-armed Battleship, Designing, proposed.
      Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Aug. 9*, 1526; Earl of Selborne, 1530.
  "Blake," H.M.S., Accident on—Recognition of heroism of Chief Stoker Gee.
    Q. Mr. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 2*, 513, 514.
  Boilers.
    Belleville, Merits of—Results of experiments, cost of repairs, etc.
      Os. Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1534; Earl Spencer, 1537.
    Coal consumption, Particulars as to.
      Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 2*, 522.
    Committee Report.
      Date of presenting.
        Os. Sir C. Dilke; *Aug. 4*, 1057; Mr. Pretyman, 1063.
        Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 2*, 522.
      Presented, *Aug. 2*, 395, 508.
    Variety of types in use. Dangers and inconveniences arising from.
      Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1057; Mr. Pretyman, 1063; Earl of Selborne, 1535, 1536.
  Comparison of British Fleets with those of Foreign Countries, Futility of.
    Os. Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1531, 1532.
  Courts-Martial held, and summary punishments inflicted on Seamen during 1903—Return of number of, presented, *Aug. 1*, 163, 253.
  Cruisers, New, Information as to design of, etc.
    O. Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 4*, 1064.
  Cunard Agreement, *see that title.*
  Duties of.
    O. Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 4*, 1055, 1056.
  Expenditure on.
    Colonies and Dependencies, Contributions from—Return presented, *Aug. 4*, 953.
    Increase in—Possibilities of reduction.
      Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 4*, 1052, 1053, 1056; Sir C. Dilke, 1058, 1059; Mr Pretyman, 1062; Mr. Lough, 1069, 1071; Mr. Haldane, 1075; Mr. Pretyman, 1076-1078.
      Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1521; Earl of Selborne, 1527, 1529.

Navy—*cont.*
  Expenditure on—*cont.*
    References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 29, 31, 34.
    Statement on, delay in presenting, etc.
      Qs. Mr. E. Robertson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1375, 1376.
  Flogging, Abolition of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug 4*, 999.
  Fortresses, Defence of—Entrusting to the Marines, proposed.
    Os Lord G. Hamilton, *Aug. 8*, 1399, 1400; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1464.
  Gun Mountings, Time required for construction of.
    Os. Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1530, 1531.
  Health of—Statistical Report for 1903, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1333.
  Importance of, to the maintenance of the Empire.
    Os. Earl Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1529; Earl Spencer, 1538.
  Lerwick, Visit to, proposed.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 4*, 975.
  Mercantile Marine "Greyhounds," Value of, in time of War.
    O. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1525.
  Officers—Return of officers permitted to hold civil employment of profit under Public Departments, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1332.
  Prize Money, Accounts showing receipts and expenditure of, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1332.
  Reserve.
    Increase in, Steps taken to further.
      Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1521, 1522; Earl of Selborne, 1536.
    Ullapool, Progress of establishment of station at.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 1*, 259.
  Russo-Japanese War, Lessons of.
    Os. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 4*, 1071; Lord Ellenborough, *Aug. 9*, 1526; Earl of Selborne, 1533, 1535, 1536.
  Savings Bank—Account of deposits, etc, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1332.
  Scouts—Speed, Coal capacity, etc.,
    Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1523-1525; Earl of Selborne, 1532, 1533.
  Seamen—Courts-martial held and summary punishments inflicted during 1903—Return of number of, presented *Aug. 1*, 163, 253.
  Shipbuilding.
    Battleships of "Lord Nelson" Class, Information as to design of.
      Os Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1057; Mr. Pretyman, 1063.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Shipbuilding—*cont.*

Cruisers, Information as to design of, etc.
O. Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 4*, 1064.

Expenditure on, Increase in.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 4*, 1052, 1053; Mr. Pretyman, 1061, 1062; Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1522, 1523; Earl of Selborne, 1530.

Repairs, cost of, etc.
O. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1525.

Small Type of heavily armed Battle ship, Designing, proposed.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Aug. 9*, 1526; Earl of Selborne, 1530.

Type of new Battleships, Increased Cost and Size of, etc.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1523; Lord Ellenborough, 1525, 1526; Earl of Selborne, 1530; Earl Spencer, 1538.

Vote for, Delay in Introduction of.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 4*, 1052; Sir C. Dilke, 1057.

Simon's Bay, Naval Works at, Expenditure on, etc.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1522; Earl of Selborne, 1535.

Strength of.

Comparison with Navies of France, Germany and Russia.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 4*, 1053-1055; Mr. Pretyman, 1059, 1062; Mr. R. Lucas, 1067, 1068; Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1522.

Two-Power Standard, *see that subheading.*

Submarines, Value of, for Offensive and Defensive Purposes etc.
O. Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1533, 1534.

Torpedo Boats and Destroyers—Mistaken Policy of Reduction in Speed of.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *Aug. 4*, 1064-1066; Mr. Pretyman, 1075, 1076.

Two-Power Standard.

Abandonment of, in Favour of a Three-Power Standard, alleged.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 4*, 1053-1056; Mr. Pretyman, 1060, 1061; Mr. Lough, 1069-1071.

Definition of, Necessity for.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 4*, 1056; Sir C. Dilke, 1058; Mr. Pretyman, 1060; Mr. R. Lucas, 1067, 1068; Mr. Lough, 1069; Sir J. Colomb, 1072-1074; Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1528.

Origin of.
O. Lord Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1528.

Navy—*cont.*

Works.

Expenditure on, Increase in—Information as to Class of Works, etc.
Os. Earl of Selborne, *Aug. 9*, 1535; Earl Spencer, 1538.

Simon's Bay, Expenditure on Works at.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1522; Earl of Selborne, 1535.

Navy Estimates

Admiralty Office—£327,400, *Com.*Aug. 9*, 1663.

Educational Services—£154,000, *Com.*Aug. 9*, 1663.

Pensions, Gratuities, etc., Naval and Marine—£1,208,800, *Com.* Aug. 9*, 1664.

Savings and Deficiences on Grants, etc.—Committee to Consider, *Aug. 8*, 1488.

Shipbuilding—Contract Work, Repairs etc.—£10,314,000, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 1051.

Surpluses on certain Votes, Application of, to cover Deficiencies on other Votes—Resolution in Committee of Supply, *Aug. 9*, 1671-1674.

Neagh, Lough

Drainage of—Report Presented, *Aug. 1*, 163, 253.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill

c. con. and 3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1330.

l. Commons' Amends., *Con.* Aug. 8*, 1281.

Netherlands

Godden, Mr. J., Wrongs Inflicted upon, by Dutch Colonial Authorities—Reply to British Government Representation
Qs. Sir E. Flower; *As.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 9*, 1561.

New Guinea, British

Civil Servants—Service of, previous to Transfer of Territory to Australia, Reckoning, when computing Pensions, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 1*, 264, 265.

New Writs and New Members Sworn

see those titles under Parliamentary By-Elections.

Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill

l. 3R.* *Aug. 4*, 838.

Newcastle (Ireland)

Constabulary, Royal Irish—Testimony as to Character of Prisoners—Letter written by Head Constable Smith, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 5*, 1217.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill
c. *con.** *Aug. 4*, 951.
3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1329.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *Aug. 8*; *Aug. 9*, 1489.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Through Toll, Abolition of, Question of Compensation, etc.
Os. Duke of Northumberland, *Aug. 5*, 1086, 1090, 1092; Earl of Kintore, 1088; Lord Glenesk, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 1090; Lord Kenyon, Earl Cawdor, 1093.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill
c. *Con.** *Aug. 1*, 252.
3R.* *Aug. 4*, 950.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *Aug. 5*, 1085.

Newspapers
Crime, Incitement to, by Publication of Articles, alleged, Action as to, proposed—Example of Old Bailey Counterfeit Coining Case, etc.
Os. Mr. T. Taylor, *Aug. 4*, 1034; Mr. A. Douglas, 1045, 1046.
Q. Mr. T. Taylor; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 271.

Newton, Lord
Finance Bill—Date of bringing before the House of Lords—Inadequate Opportunity for Discussion, *July 29*, 16.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1152, 1156.
Macedonia, Reorganisation of *Gendarmerie*—Position of Affairs, Increase in Number of Austrian and Russian Officers, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1097.

Nicholson Estate, Ireland
Administration of, by Land Judge's Court—Utilisation of Grazing Farm for Enlarging Small Holdings, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 275.

Niger and Lake Chad
Boundary Commission, Work of, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 9*, 1557.
Q. Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 9*, 1558.

Nolan, Col. J. P. [Galway, N.]
Roman Catholic University for Ireland, Need for, *Aug. 3*, 797.

Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton, S.]
China.
Tung-Ting Lake, German endeavour to lease, alleged, *Aug. 9*, 1560.
Wei-hai-Wei, Terms of holding, Modification of, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1561.

Norman, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Cunard Agreement, Facilities for adequate discussion of, *Aug. 3*, 831.
Explosives, Conveyance of, on Passenger Ships, Regulations as to, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1557.
Japan, Indian subject requested by, to return to India, alleged, *Aug. 9*, 1559.
Niger and Lake Chad Boundary Commission, Work of, Cost, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1557, 1558.
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1628.

North Sea Investigations, International
"Jackal," H.M.S., Employment of, Reasons for
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 3*, 709.

North Wales Electric Power Bill
c. *Con.*,* *July 29*, 78.
3R.* *Aug. 2*, 507.
l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.*,* *Aug. 4*, 837.

Northumberland, Duke of
Licensing Bill, Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1297.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1086, 1090, 1092.

Norton, Captain C. W. [Newington, W.]
Africa South, Garrison in, Unpopularity of, *Aug. 8*, 1446.
Army.
Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1441–1446.
Soldiers, Summer Headgear for, Issue of, *Aug. 8*, 1349.
Coaling Stations, Garrisoning of, *Aug. 2*, 609.
Committee of Defence, Value of, in coordinating the two Services, etc, *Aug. 2*, 608–611.
Compulsory Service, Cost of, *Aug. 8*, 1443, 1444.
Glasgow Workmen's Trains, Improvement of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1356.
India, Invasion of, Possibility of, *Aug. 2*, 610.
Militia Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1445.
Police Examination of Hackney Carriages, Damage caused by, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1355.
Post Office Sorters—Compensation for Stolen Overcoats, *Aug. 5*, 1212.

Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board Bill
c. *Con.*,* *Aug. 5*, 1210.
3R.* *Aug.* 9, 1539.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 9*, 1489.

O'Brien, Mr. J. F. X. [Cork]

Mahony, Mr. T., Land Appeal of, Reason for Postponement of Hearing, *Aug. 1*, 277, 278.

Smallpox, Powers of Local Authorities to make Byelaws as to, under Irish Public Health Act—Request of Cork Port Sanitary Authority, etc., *Aug. 1*, 276.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]

Ely, Marquess of, Sale of Estates of—Progress of Negotiations, *Aug. 4*, 969.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]

Civil Servants' hours of Daily Attendance under Order-in-Council, Aug. 1890, Provisions as to Extra Annual Leave, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1552.

Fitzwilliam, Earl, Estate of—Number of Ejectment Notices served, etc., *Aug. 4*, 991.

Glasgow Assistant Postmen, Accelerating Promotion of, *Aug. 9*, 1551.

Kilbride Camp Canteen Licence, Irregularity in Signing, by Magistrate—Decision as to action of Mr. Shanks, *Aug. 1*, 278, 279.

Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report, Opportunity for Discussing, etc., *Aug. 4*, 984.

Telegraph Vote, Date of Taking, *Aug. 8*, 1375.

O'Doherty, Mr. W. [Donegal, S.]

Irish Society—Particulars as to Mortgages held by Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland and others, *July 29*, 86; *Aug. 1*, 263.

O'Donnell, Mr. J. [Mayo, S.]

Armagh Poor Law Officials.

Assistant Teacher and Catechist, Abolition of Office of—Pension granted to Miss M'Kee, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1218.

Religious Denominations of, *Aug. 5*, 1217.

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway.

Guarantee, Conditions of, *Aug. 8*, 1333.

Overcrowding on, alleged, *Aug. 4*, 973.

Burke, Isadore, Estate, Sale of—Particulars as to Disposal of Grazing Lands, *Aug. 4*, 974.

Clanmorris, Lord, Estate of—Particulars as to Negotiations for Sale, *Aug. 4*, 973.

Irishtown—Additional Delivery of Letters and Free Delivery of Telegrams throughout Village, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 966.

O'Donnell, Mr. J.—*cont.*

Land Purchase, Ireland.

Grazing Lands, Return as to Proposals to Purchase, suggested, *Aug. 4*, 972.

Transactions under Act of 1903 up to 31st July, 1904, Particulars as to, *Aug. 4*, 971.

Postmasters, Assistant, Hours of Duty, Pay, etc., of, *Aug. 4*, 965.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]

Fenit Harbour Board, Inquiry into, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1356.

Irish Language, Instruction in, at National School of St. Luke (Cork)—Inquiry as to Examinations, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1360.

Marshall Estate—Applications for Reinstatement by Evicted Tenants, *Aug 8* 1360.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]

Lavagh — Additional Postal Facilities, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1370.

Nicholson Estate, Administration of, by Land Judge's Court—Utilisation of Grazing Farm for enlarging small holdings, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 275.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]

Constabulary, Royal Irish — Constable Robinson, Marriage of, against Regulations—refusal to support Wife, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1359.

Onslow, Earl of—*President of the Board of Agriculture.*

Licensing Bill.

2R. *Aug. 2*, 417–427.

Com., *Aug. 4*, 865, 866, 870, 874, 909–912, 936; *Aug. 5*, 1117, 1118, 1122, 1123, 1154, 1164, 1166, 1190, 1200.

Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1288, 1302, 1303.

Orange River Colony

Administration—Representative Government, Proposals as to.

Os. Lord Coleridge, *Aug. 5*, 1101; Duke of Marlborough, 1104.

Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 2*, 524.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]

Dunraven, Lord, Sale of Estate of, *Aug. 3*, 729.

Southwell, Lord, Sale of Estate of, *Aug. 3*, 729.

Oswestry

Parliamentary By-election—New Member Sworn, *Aug. 1*, 284.

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 2) Bill

c. 2R.* *Aug. 9*, 1706.

Paraguay
Trade Report Presented, *July 29*, 3.

Parliament
House of Commons.
Adjournments, *and* Sittings of the House, *see those titles.*
Business of the House, *see that title.*
Committees, *see that title.*
Divisions, *see that title.*
Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms—Report Presented, *Aug. 9*, 1567.
Post Office in Lobby, Enlargement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Aug. 9*, 1564.
Telegraph Office in Members' Lobby, Defective Ventilation of, alleged.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Aug. 4*, 963, 964.
Ventilation of, Improvements in.
Inlet Fan, Particulars as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Aug. 4*, 985.
Plant, Names of Firms tendering for supplying.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *July 29*, 85.
Watts, Painting by, in Grand Committee Room—Condition of Picture, Removal to more appropriate place, etc.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Aug. 4*, 964.
House of Lords.
Offices—Report of Select Committee presented, *Aug. 4*, 949.
Con. Aug. 9*, 1539.
Representative Peer for Ireland—Lord Bellew, Election of—Writs, Returns, and Certificates presented, *Aug. 2*, 393.
Sat first—Lord Minster, after the Death of his Father, *Aug. 4*, 837.
Took the Oath—Lord Bellew, *Aug. 4*, 837.
Prorogation, date of.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1378.

Standing Orders, *see that title.*

Parliamentary By-Elections
New Members Sworn.
Bright, Mr. A. H., for County of Salop (Western or Oswestry Division), *Aug. 1*, 284.
Isaacs, Mr. R. D., for Borough of Reading, *Aug. 9*, 1567.
Polling Districts, *see that title.*
New Writs—Reading, Borough of, *July 29*, 90.

Parliamentary Procedure
Closure of Debate, Application of Standing Order No. 26, Return as to, ordered, *Aug. 2*, 510, presented, 707.
Committee, Rule as to Number of Times a Member may speak in.
Os. Mr. Moss, Mr. J. W. Lowther, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 2*, 655.
New Rules, Failure of.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *Aug. 2*, 567; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 578.
Small Government Bills, Absence of Rules to ensure passing of.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug.* 2, 581, 582.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 355–360.
Local Authorities, Audit of Accounts of—Committee to Consider, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1549.
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug.* 9, 1628.

Patent Medicines
Restrictions on Advertisements of, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. Chamberlayne; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 518.

Paupers
see under Poor Law.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
Darenth Water pumping station—Purity of water, liability to pollution by surface drainage, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1339.
Licensing Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 137.

Peel, Viscount
Licensing Bill.
2 R., *Aug. 1*, 175–187.
Com., *Aug. 4*, 858, 912–914.

Penal Servitude Bill
c. Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1083.

Percy Earl—*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Kensington, S.]
Acheen, Dutch War with—British Government representations as to cessation of hostilities and reference of dispute to the Hague Peace Tribunal, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 962.
Balkans, Agreement by Russia and Austria as to countries South of, *Aug. 4*, 978.
China—Tung Ting Lake, German endeavour to lease, alleged, *Aug. 9*, 1561.
Congo.
Free State, Ill-treatment of Boma Natives—Case of M. de Tiège, *Aug. 4*, 976.
French—Claims of British Merchants, Interpretation of free trade clauses of Berlin Act, etc.—Progress of Negotiations, *Aug. 1*, 269.

[*cont.*

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
  Contraband of War.
    Belligerent right to define without reference to neutral Powers—Protest against extention by Japanese and Russian Governments, etc., *Aug. 1*, 269.
    Cotton as — Declaration by Russian Government, *Aug. 1*, 269.
  Crete.
    Jaunaris, Dr. — Nature of offence, British Government representations as to extension of clemency, etc., *Aug. 1*, 260; *Aug. 4*, 976, 977.
  Egypt.
    Arbitration Treaty between France and Great Britain.
      Egyptian opinion on, ascertaining, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1353.
      European assent to Egyptian Clauses, *Aug. 8*, 1352.
    Army, Augmentation of, by appointment of British officers, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 713.
    Civil Service, Regulations for entering, *Aug. 4*, 976.
    Crime in, Inquiry as to growth of, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1352.
    Finance.
      Caisse de la Dette, period for termination of, *Aug. 3*, 718.
      Proposals as to, *Aug. 9*, 1560.
    Mecca Pilgrims, arrangements made for safety of, *Aug. 3*, 718.
    Orphans and destitute poor, care of, Information as to, *Aug. 5*, 1213.
  France—Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain, Egyptian Clauses of.
    Egyptian opinion on, Ascertaining, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1353.
    European assent to, *Aug. 8*, 1352.
  Horses, Old, Disposal of, in Holland, Belgium and Germany, Inquiry as to, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 977.
  Macedonia—*Gendarmerie*, Reorganisation of—increase in Russian and Austrian officers, alleged—Reason, etc., *Aug. 4*, 962, 977, 978.
  Mecca Pilgrims, Arrangements by Egyptian Government for safety of, *Aug. 3*, 718.
  Netherlands Colonial Government, wrongs inflicted by, upon Mr. J. Godden—Reply to representations, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1561.
  Soudan.
    Civil Service, Regulations for entering, *Aug. 4*, 976.
    Niger and Lake Chad Boundary Commission, Work of, Cost, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1557.
  United States of America—Irish-cured fish, Import duty on—negotiations as to reduction, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1353.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
  Venezuela Tariffs — Differential surtax, question of, *Aug. 4*, 978.
  Wei-hai-Wei, terms of holding, negotiations as to modification, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1561.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
  c. Con. Aug. 2*, 507.
  l. 3R.* *Aug. 9*, 1489.

Petitions
  Public—number presented and printed in 1904—Return Ordered, *Aug. 2*, 511; presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.

Philipps, Mr. J. W. [Pembroke]
  Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com., Aug. 5*, 1253.

Physical Deterioration
  Factories and Workshops, physical condition of workers in.
    Os. Mr. Tennant, *Aug 4.* 1009, 1010; Mr. Burns, 1024, 1025.
  Inter-departmental Committee on.
    Minutes of Evidence and list of witnesses presented, *Aug. 2*, 396, 509.
    Report.
      Appendix and General Index presented, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.
      Recommendations of.
        Qs. Mr. C. Warner; *As.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 1*, 270.
        Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 3*, 720.
        Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 4*, 985.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
  l. Com. July 29*, 3.
  Rep.* *Aug. 1.* 163.
  3R.* *Aug. 2*, 394.
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 5*, 1210.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No 3) Bill
  l. 2R.* *Aug. 2*, 394.
  Com. Aug. 4*, 838
  Rep.* *Aug. 5*, 1085.
  3R.* *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Piers and Harbours
  Ireland.
    Bangor — Estimate for Harbour, Amount to be contributed by Department of Agriculture, etc.
      Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 985, 986.
    Fenit Harbour Board, Inquiry into, proposed.
      Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1356, 1357.
    Kinvara, Improvement of, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 273.

[*cont.*

Piers and Harbours—*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Portavogie Harbour improvements.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 3*, 730, 731.

Plymouth

Port Regulations—Draft Order in Council—Ascertaining Local opinion, proposed.
Q. Mr. Duke; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 4*, 959.

Police

Evidence given by, Objections to practice—Inspector subpœnaed in case of Sievier *v* Duke.
Os. Mr. Atherley-Jones, *Aug. 4*, 1049, 1050; Mr. A. Akers-Douglas, 1049.

Hackney carriages, damage caused in inspecting, alleged.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. A. Akers-Douglas, *Aug. 8*, 1355.

India, *see that title.*

Ireland, *see* Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Metropolitan—Rent allowance, Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Slack, Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. Akers-Douglas, *Aug. 4*, 981, 982.

Police and Sanitary Committee

Special Report presented, *Aug. 5*, 1219.

Police Stations

Cells, Management of, Inquiry as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. A. Akers-Douglas, *Aug. 9*, 1548.

Police Superannuation Bill

c. Order for Consideration read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

Polling Districts

Hertford, County of.

Hertford, or Eastern Division—County Council Order re-dividing presented, *July*, *29*, 4, 79.

St. Albans, or Mid Division—County Council Order re-dividing, presented, *July 29*, 4, 79.

Poor Law

Children—Boarding-out system—Payment to cottagers, revision of arrangements for, proposed.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 5*, 1212, 1213.

Death rate and Infant Mortality in London and provincial unions.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 515, 516.

Ireland.

Dublin, North—Guardianship of John Morris, Powers of Board of Guardians, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 989, 990.

Poor Law—*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Macroom Union, decision as to Clerkship of.
Q. Mr. Tully; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 727.

Officials, Religious denominations of, in Armagh.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 5*, 1217, 1218.

Medical Officers of Health.

Number employed by County Councils, Terms of Appointment, etc.—Return presented, *Aug 8*, 1331.

Scotland.

Durness—Dismissal of Medical Officer by Parish Council, Expenses of reinstatement, protection of Medical Officers, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. A. Graham Murray, *Aug. 1*, 258; *Aug. 3*, 709, 710.

Highlands and Islands, Insufficiency of Medical Officers in.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592; Mr. S. Dickson, 1596; Sir W. Foster, 1599.

Number appointed without Public Health Diplomas.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592; Mr. S. Dickson, 1596.

Return as to Local Officers, Inaccuracy of.
O. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1593.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 5.* 1213, 1214.

Pauperism, Ratio of, to population in London and provincial unions.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 515, 516.

Paupers—Consumptives in London, treatment of, by Metropolitan Asylums Board, proposed.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 8*, 1357.

Relief.

Cost per head of population in London and provincial unions.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 2*, 515, 516.

Out-door—Milk and feeding-bottles, supply of, for infants, proposed.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *Aug. 1*, 259, 260.

Sandgate Homes—Pauper Inmates, Number, Complaints, Number chargeable to each Metropolitan Union, Amount paid per head, etc.—Return presented, *Aug. 8*, 1331.

Scotland—Medical Officers, *see under sub-heading* Medical Officers.

Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill
l. Com., *July 29*, 76.
Rep.* *Aug. 1*, 250.
3R., *Aug. 2*, 505.
c. 1R.* *Aug. 4*, 952.
2R.* *Aug. 8*, 1487
*Com.** and 3R.* *Aug. 9*, 1706.
Ireland, Exemption of, from provisions of the Bill.
O. Earl Waldegrave, *July 29*, 77.

Poor Prisoners' Defence Act
Provisions of—Making known to Magistrates and posting in prison cells, etc.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *July 29*, 86.

Port of London Bill
c. Order for Committee read, and Bill withdrawn,* *Aug. 8*, 1486.
Abandonment of.
Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug. 2*, 559; Mr. Lloyd-George, 561; Mr. Galloway, 564; Mr. S. Buxton, 565, 566; Mr. Bryce, 567; Sir J. Dimsdale, 568; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 580.
Carrying over, to next Session proposed.
Q. Gen. Lawrie; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1348.
Q. Sir A. Rollit; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1374.

Portadown
Disturbances, result of inquiry as to.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 722.

Portavogie, Ireland
Harbour, improvements in.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 3*, 730, 731.

Porthcawl
Rifle Range, Expenditure on, date of completion, etc.
Q. Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1349.

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 1*, 161.

Portrush, Ireland
Post Office Business, Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 964, 965.

Portsmouth, Earl of
Army, Expenditure on, increase in, *July 29*, 37.
Finance Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 37; *Com.*, *July 29*, 41; 3R., *July 29*, 43.
Date of bringing before the House of Lords—Objections to suspension of Standing Order 39, etc., *July 29*, 14, 15.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*cont.*
Financial condition of the Country, *July 29*, 38, 39.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 861; *Aug. 5*, 1177, 1181.
Transvaal War Contribution, arrangements as to payment of, *July 29*, 39, 43.

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Lord Stanley.
Carless, Mr., case of — Reinvestigation, etc.
Os. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 9*, 1609; Lord Stanley, 1630.
Civil Servants' hours of daily attendance under Order in Council Aug., 1890, Provisions as to extra annual leave, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 9*, 1552.
Counter Clerks in London, Checking stocks of.
Q. Mr. D. Morgan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 9*, 1562.
Estimate, *see under* Civil Service Estimates.
Grievances.
Court of Appeal, establishment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Broadhurst, *Aug. 9*, 1615; Mr. H. Samuel, 1618, 1619.
Political pressure upon Members of Parliament by Post Office employees, etc.
Os. Mr. Rutherford, *Aug. 9*, 1617; Mr. H. Samuel, 1618; Sir G. Parker, 1629; Lord Stanley, 1632.
Inspection of premises for sanitary purposes, Regulations as to.
Os. Sir J. Haslett, *Aug. 9*, 1627; Lord Stanley, 1631.
Ireland.
Ballymoney, amount of business at.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 964, 965.
Bangor—Increase in accommodation for Post Office business proposed.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 964, 965.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Lord Stanley; *Aug. 4*, 996.
Belfast.
Cloak room accommodation, Extension of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug, 9*, 1566.
Garfield Street Office, Improvement in posting arrangements at, proposed.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 3*, 731, 732.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Belfast—*cont.*
      Sorters, Illness of, and accidents to—Regulations as to dismissal, medical treatment, sick leave, etc.
        Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 9, 1565, 1566.
      Sorting office, Improvement in ventilation of, etc.
        Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 9, 1552.
      Staff, increase in, at stamp counter.
        Qs. Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 3, 731, 732.
    Dublin Sorting Office defalcations—Information as to Corcoran case.
      Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 3, 732, 733.
    Edgeworthstown—Retiring allowance to Assistant, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 2, 515.
    Irishtown — Additional delivery of letters, proposed.
      Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 4, 966.
    Lavagh, Additional facilities for, proposed.
      Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 8, 1370.
    Portrush, amount of business at.
      Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 4, 964, 965.
    Town sub-postmasters, Increase of salaries alleged to be withheld from, Report on, in 1902, receipt of, by Postmaster-General, etc.
      Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 8, 1370, 1371.
  Leeds—Telegraph Superintendents' Survey Branch, filling vacancy in.
    Q. Mr. Barran; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 2, 515.
  Letters—Public Holidays.
    Obtaining letters on, free of charge by calling at Post Office, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 3, 719.
    Special deliveries on, Revenue derived from extra charge on letters.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 3, 711.
  Mails Contract with Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. for conveyance of Indian, China, and Australian Mails—Copy ordered, *Aug.* 4, 954.
  Parcel Post—Transvaal, prohibition of despatch of gold goods to, by Transvaal authorities.
    Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 3, 718, 719.

Post Office—*cont.*
  Post Marks, Illegibility of, alleged.
    Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 3, 711.
    Q. Mr. Skewes-Cox; A. Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 8, 1354.
  Postmasters.
    Assistant Postmasters—hours of duty, pay, Class of officials referred to as, etc.
      Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 4, 965.
    Sub-postmasters, Irishtown, Increase of salaries alleged to be withheld from, Report on, in 1902, receipt of, by Postmaster-General, etc.
      Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 8, 1370, 1371.
  Postmen.
    Auxiliary, Improvement in Position of.
      Os. Mr. Broadhurst, *Aug.* 9, 1614; Lord Stanley, 1631.
    Christmas Boxes, abolition of, proposed.
      Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug.* 9, 1604; Mr. Lough, 1609; Mr. Nannetti, 1624, 1634; Sir J. Haslett, 1624; Lord Stanley, 1634.
    Glasgow Assistant postmen, acceleration of promotion of.
      Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 9, 1551.
  Wages, *see that sub-heading.*
  Report of Postmaster-General.
    Date of Issue.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 9, 1561, 1562.
    Presented, *Aug.* 8, 1285, 1332.
  Savings Bank, *see that title.*
  Scotland.
    Glasgow Postmen, Assistant, Acceleration of Promotion of.
      Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 9, 1551.
    Tain Post Office, Charge on Letters Addressed to.
      Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 2, 514; *Aug.* 3, 719.
  Sorter Tracers, Reply to Memorial from.
    Q. Sir H. Kimber; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 3, 711.
  Sorters.
    Illness of, and Accidents to—Regulations as to Dismissal, Medical Attendance, Sick Leave, etc.
      Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 9, 1565, 1566.
    Stolen Overcoats, Compensation for, etc.
      Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 5, 1212.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Telegraph and Telephone Services, *see those titles.*

Unestablished Staff, Placing on the Establishment—Revision of present System, proposed.
O. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 9*, 1608.

Wages.

Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations.
Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug. 9*, 1600; Mr. Lough, 1605; Mr. Hay, 1610, 1613; Mr. Broadhurst, 1613; Mr. Rutherford, 1615; Mr. H. Samuel, 1617; Mr. H. Heaton, 1619, 1623; Mr. Nannetti, 1621, 1622, 1634; Sir J. Haslett, 1624; Sir G. Parker, Mr. Norman, 1628; Lord Stanley, 1606, 1614, 1615, 1630.

Statement, Date of Making, Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
Os. Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Lough, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Lord Stanley, *Aug. 3*, 735, 736.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 984.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug.* 8, 1375.

Christmas Boxes, Abolition of, proproposed.
Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug. 9*, 1604; Mr. Lough, 1609; Mr. Nannetti, 1624, 1634; Sir J. Haslett, 1624; Lord Stanley, 1634.

Cost of, Proposed Increase in.
Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug. 9*, 1605; Mr. C. Hay, 1611; Mr. H. Samuel, 1619; Mr. H. Heaton, 1620; Mr. Nannetti, 1623.

Population as a Basis for Calculating.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Aug. 9*, 1612; Mr. Broadhurst, 1614; Sir J. Haslett, 1625; Mr. Norman, 1628, Lord Stanley, 1635.

Tweedmouth Report, Recommendations of, Terms of Reference, Constitution, etc.
Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug. 9*, 1601; Mr. Lough, 1606.

Wapping—Establishment of Post Office west of Wapping Bridge, proposed.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 29*, 82.

Women Employed in, Inadequate Salaries paid to.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *Aug 9*, 1630; Lord Stanley, 1635.

Post Office Bill
c. Com., Rep. and 3R., *July 29*, 159.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 164.
2R. *Aug. 5*, 1105.
Com., and Rep.* *Aug. 8*, 1328.
3R.* *Aug. 9*, 1539.

Post Office Sites Bill
c. Report from Select Committee, *Aug. 1*, 284.
Com., *Aug. 5*, 1274; *Aug. 8*, 1487.
3R., *Aug. 8*, 1487.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 9*, 1539.
Recommitment of, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Whitley; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Lord Stanley, *Aug. 2*, 540, 541.

Postmasters
see under Post Office.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Beresford Estate, Proceedings as to Sale of, *Aug. 4*, 988.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Earl of Onslow.

President of the Board of Education
Marquess of Londonderry.

President of the Board of Trade
Mr. Gerald W. Balfour.

President of the Local Government Board
Mr. Walter H. Long.

Pretyman, Mr. E. G.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Suffolk, Woodbridge]

Administration of the Navy—Inquiry into, by Committee of Experts, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1075.

Battleships—"Lord Nelson" Class, Information as to Design of, *Aug. 4*, 1063.

"Blake," H.M.S., Accident on—Recognition of Heroism of Chief Stoker Gee, *Aug. 2*, 514.

Boilers.
Coal Consumption, Particulars as to, *Aug. 2*, 522.

Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Aug. 2*, 522; *Aug. 4*, 1063.

Variety of Types in use, *Aug. 4*, 1063.

Cunard Agreement.
Date of Completion of Steamers, *Aug. 2*, 696.

Terms of, *Aug. 2*, 689, 690, 694, 695; *Aug. 8*, 1474.

Cruisers, New, Information as to Design of, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1064.

Devonport Dockyard.
Petitions from Workmen, Delay in Replying to, alleged, *July 29*. 87.

Unskilled Labour, Increase in Wages for, proposed, *July 29*, 87.

Welsford, W., Compensation to, for Injuries—Revision of Amount proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1339.

[*cont.*

Pretyman, Mr. E. G.—*cont.*

Expenditure, Increase in—Possibilities of Reduction, *Aug. 4*, 1061, 1062, 1076-1078.

Explosives, Conveyance of, on Passenger Ships, Regulations as to, &c., *Aug. 9*, 1558.

Lerwick, Naval Visit to, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 975.

Plymouth—Port Regulations, Proposed new—Ascertaining Local Opinion, *Aug. 4*, 959.

Reserve—Ullapool, Establishment of Station at, Progress made in, &c., *Aug 1*, 259.

Shipbuilding.

Cruisers, Information as to Design of, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1064.

Expenditure on, Increase in, *Aug. 4*, 1061, 1062.

"Lord Nelson" class of Battleship, Information as to Design of, *Aug. 4*, 1063.

Strength of the Navy—Comparison with Navies of France, Germany and Russia, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1059, 1062.

Torpedo Boats and Destroyers, Speed of, Reduction in, *Aug. 4*, 1075, 1076.

Two-Power Standard.

Abandonment of, in Favour of a Three-Power Standard, alleged, *Aug. 4*, 1060, 1061.

Definition of, *Aug. 4*, 1060.

Ullapool, Establishment of Naval Reserve Station at, Progress made, etc., *Aug. 1*, 259.

Prime Minister

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Prisons

Dartmoor—Officials, Quarters of—Extension proposed.

O. Mr. C. Hay, *Aug. 9*, 1612.

Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 9*, 1555.

Estimate for, *Aug. 9*, 1645.

Holloway—Prisoners under Remand, Hair-cutting Regulations for.

Qs. Mr. C. Hay, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 4*, 982, 983.

Ireland.

Estimate for, *Aug. 9*, 1647.

Londonderry Warders—Duties, Religious Denominations, etc.

Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1343, 1344.

Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, Provisions of—Placards to be placed in Cells, etc.

Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *July 29*, 86.

Scotland, Estimate for, *Aug. 9*, 1646.

Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Act

Joint Committees under, Standing Order Constituting, *Aug. 9*, 1490, 1495, 1545.

Private Bills

see under Bills.

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899

Draft Provisional Orders, Number of, issued, Names of Commissioners, etc. Return Ordered, *Aug. 3*, 708; Presented, *Aug. 9*, 1546.

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill

Lords' Message to Commons for Reports, etc., of Select Committee, *Aug. 4*, 839.

c. Report from Select Committee—Copies for the House of Lords, *Aug. 8*, 1379

Provisional Order (Marriages) Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug 8*, 1486.

Prize Money

Naval—Accounts showing Receipts and Expenditure of, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1332.

Public Accounts Committee

Report, Opportunity for Discussing.

Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Lloyd-George; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 283.

Public Bills

see under Bills.

Public Health Bill

c. 2R.* *Aug. 9*, 1706.

Public Petitions

see Petitions.

Public Works Loans Bill

c. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 284.

Particulars of Loans—Statement Ordered, *Aug. 1*, 253; presented, *Aug. 4*, 953.

Purvis, Mr. R. [Peterborough]

Fiscal Policy of the Country, proposed changes in, *Aug. 1*, 350, 351.

Queen's Colleges, Ireland

Belfast—Annual Report of President, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Cork.

Administration of, etc.

O. Mr. S. MacNeill, *Aug. 3*, 796.

Examinations in Arts, distinctions gained, etc.

Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 728, 729, 730.

Galway—Annual Report of President Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1331.

Questions
  Speaker's Rulings as to, *see under* Speaker

Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill
  c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.* Aug. 2*, 505.

Raglan, Lord
  Militia Reform Proposals, *July 29*, 55, 61

Railways
  Inspectors — Additional Sub-Inspector, Appointment of
    Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 964.
  Ireland.
    Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway.
    Guarantee, Conditions of.
      Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 8*, 1333, 1334.
    Overcrowding, alleged Provision of extra carriages by Midland Great Western Railway Company, etc.
      Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 973.
    Great Southern and Western Railway, Insufficiency of arrangements for conveyance of horses to Cork show, alleged.
      Qs. Capt. Donelan: *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 532.
    Tireragh district, Petition for Construction of Railway in.
      Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 274, 275.
  Light—Number authorised, Amount of Capital paid up, etc—Return Presented.
  Metropolitan and Metropolitan District—Electric traction, delay in introducing, alleged.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July 29*, 83, 84.
  Scotland—Workmen's trains from Glasgow, Improvement in accommodation on, proposed.
    Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1356.
  Servants, Hours of, in October 1903—Date of presenting Return
    Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 517.
  Uganda, *see* Uganda.
  Workmen's Trains.
    Report from Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence presented, *Aug. 3*, 736.
    Scotland—Trains from Glasgow, improvement in accommodation on, proposed.
      Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1356.

Rasch, Major Sir F. Carne [Essex, Chelmsford]
  Army.
    Camps, Litter for Horses in—Allocation of straw contracts at Colchester, Cost of Peat Moss, etc., *Aug. 3*, 716.
    Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1407, 1408.
      Reduction, Exemption of certain Battalions from, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 716.

Rathmines
  Commissioners, Appeal of, Against Order of Dublin County Council, decision as to.
    Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 278.

Reading, Borough of
  Parliamentary By-Election—New Writ, *July 29*, 90.
  New Member Sworn, *Aug. 9*, 1567.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
  Anderson, Constable, Charges against and dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 778.
  Under-Secretary for Ireland, Undue interference of, in Irish Affairs, alleged *Aug. 3*, 777.
  University Education in Ireland, Facilities for, *Aug. 3*, 805–807.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
  Scariff River, Examination of, with a view to drainage, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 968.

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 29*, 160.
  l. Commons' Amendt. to Lords' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 2*, 398.

Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
  Docks, Regulations for, under Factory Act, Date and period of tabling, etc., *Aug. 2*, 527, 528.

Representative Peers for Ireland
  see under Parliament—House of Lords.

Re-vaccination Bill
  l. 3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1095.

Revenue and Expenditure
  Capital Expenditure
    Borrowings for, estimated amount of
      Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 2*, 650; Mr. Buchanan, 664; Mr. Runciman, 665.
      Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 3*, 816; Mr. W. Churchill, 817.
      Os. Mr. Whitley, *Aug. 8*, 1481; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1482, 1483.
  Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill,
    c. *Com.*, *Aug. 2*, 649.
    Rep., *Aug. 3*, 808.

[*cont.*

Revenue and Expenditure—*cont.*
- Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill—*cont.*
  - Expenditure involved in, Information as to
    - *Q.* Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 8*, 1341.
  - Objections to taking Resolution after Twelve O'clock.
    - *Os.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 2*, 651, 656; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 651, 656, 657; Mr. Lloyd-George; Mr. Buchanan, 652; Mr. Whitley, Mr. W. Churchill, 653; Mr. Labouchere, 657.
  - Sinking Fund, omission as to provision for
    - *Os.* Mr. Soares, *Aug. 3*, 808; Mr. Whitley, 809; Sir. M. H. Beach, 812, 814; Mr. McKenna, 813, 814: Mr. A. Chamberlain, 815.
- Committee of Inquiry on—Report, etc., Date for discussion of
  - *Qs.* Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. W. Churchill, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 282, 283.
- Financial condition of the country.
  - *Os.* Mr. Whitley, *Aug. 3*, 809–811; Mr. W. Churchill, 818–821.
  - References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 24–26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38–40, 42.
- Increase in expenditure, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 23, 24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 39, 40, 42–45.
- Irish Contribution, Basis of calculation of
  - *Qs.* Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 2*, 536, 537.
- National Expenditure Committee, Report of, Allowing facilities for discussion of
  - *O.* Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 2*, 570.

Rhodesia
- Delegation from, to discuss terms of cancelling charter of South African Chartered Company—obtaining Parliamentary approval of terms, proposed, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 253, 254.
  - *Q.* Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 3*, 717.

Rifle Ranges
- Porthcawl—Expenditure, date of completion, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1349.

Ripon, Lord Bishop of
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 914–916.

Ripon, Marquess of
- Army Council Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 841-843.
- Leeds University Bill, 2R., *Aug. 4*, 844.
- Licensing Bill.
  - *Com.*, *Aug* 4, 857, 869, 870, 890-894, 936; *Aug. 5*, 1108, 1170.
  - Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1301, 1310.
- Transvaal Administration—Proposals as to representative Government, *Aug. 5*, 1104.

Ritualistic Practices
- Committee Report, Date of presenting.
  - *Qs.* Mr. A. Taylor, Dr. Hutchinson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 1*, 281.

Roberts, Earl
- Army Reform Proposals, Views as to.
  - *Qs* Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 256, 266.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
- Clocaenog Burial dispute—Refusal of parish bier by rector, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 528; *Aug. 9*, 1548.
- Police Stations—Cells, Inquiry as to management of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1548.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
- Admiralty Vote, date of taking, *Aug. 8*, 1377.
- Free Church of Scotland *v.* Lord Overtown, House of Lords judgment in case of—Statement as to proposed legislative action, etc., *Aug. 3*, 733, 734.
- Liquor Licences, duty on—disparaties of present system; *Aug. 9*, 1562.
- Navy.
  - Duties of, *Aug. 4*, 1055, 1056.
  - Expenditure on.
    - Increase in, *Aug. 4*, 1052, 1053, 1056.
    - Statement, Delay in presenting, *Aug. 8*, 1375, 1376.
  - Shipbuilding Vote, delay in introduction of, *Aug. 4*, 1052.
  - Strength of—Three Power Standard, alleged, *Aug. 4*, 1053–1056.
  - Vote, time for taking, *Aug.* 3, 734.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]
- Fiscal Policy of the Government, definition of, *Aug. 1*, 302–309.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
- Athenry, Graig Abbey—Purchase of Grazing Lands for Enlargement of uneconomic Holdings, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 995.

Rolleston, Sir J. F. L. [Leicester]
- Licensing Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 119–120.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, South]
- County Courts Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug 2*, 560.

[*cont.*

Rollit, Sir A. K.—*continued.*
Port of London Bill.
Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 559.
Carrying over, to next Session, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1374.
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1600.
Valuation Bill, Abandonment of, *Aug. 2*, 559

Roman Catholic University for Ireland.
see under Education—Ireland.

Roscommon
County Court Judgeship—Amalgamation of duties with Leitrim, proposed.
Q. Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1362.

Rosebery, Earl of
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 905–909, 922; *Aug. 5*, 1114, 1186.

Ross-shire
Regiments, Depot of, under Army Reform Proposals.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 1*, 264.

Rotherham Corporation Bill
l. Rep.* *July 29*, 1.
3R.* *Aug. 2*, 393.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *Aug. 8*, 1329.

Round, Right Hon. J. [Essex, Harwich]
Adulteration of Food—Appointment of expert Officer to deal with Questions as to Purity of Manufactured Foods, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 712.

Roundstone
Flags, Display of, on Licensed Premises—Illegal prohibition by Constabulary, alleged, Complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Aug. 3*, 743, 744; Mr. C. Craig, 772; Mr. Wyndham, 786, 787.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 272, *Aug. 4*, 954, 955.

Rowe Estate
Sale of—Vesting of Sporting Rights.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 8*, 1362.

Royal Commissions
Number issued in each year from 1896 to 1903—Return Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1331.

Rum and Black River, Ireland
Drainage District, Expenditure on, Persons Liable for, etc.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug 1*, 279.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
Africa, South, Garrison in—Cost, Colonial Contributions, etc., *July 29*, 89.
Canada, British Troops in—Number, Cost, Canadian Contribution, etc., *July 29*, 89.
Cunard Agreement.
Facilities for adequate Discussion of, *Aug. 2*, 658, 682.
Terms of, *Aug. 2*, 687–691; *Aug. 8*, 1475–1478.
Exchequer Bonds, Treasury Borrowings on, *Aug. 8*, 1484.
Fiscal Blue Book, Revised Edition of, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 957.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1278.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com*, *Aug. 5*, 1276.
Works, Capital Expenditure on, Estimated Amount of Borrowings for, *Aug. 2*, 665.

Russia
Balkans, Countries South of, Agreement concerning.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 978.
Coal, Amount of, Exported from Great Britain during 1904.
Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1357.
War with Japan, *see* Russo-Japanese War.

Russo-Japanese War
British Vessels Detention and Search of by Russian Warships.
Inquiry and Protest by British Government, etc.,
Os. Sir F. Banbury, Sir A. Acland-Hood, *July 29*, 160.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1373, 1374.
"Knight Commander," Inquiry as to Sinking of
Q. Mr. Hoult; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 537, 538.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1373, 1374.
"Malacca," Inquiry and Protest by British Government as to, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1371–1373.
Contraband of War, *see that title*
Naval Lessons of.
Os. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 4*, 1071; Lord Ellenborough, *Aug. 9*, 1526; Earl of Selborne, 1533, 1535, 1536.

Rutherford, Mr. J. [Lancashire, Darwen]
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1615.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *July 29*, 2.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* *Aug. 4*, 950.

St. Albans, Lord Bishop of
Licensing Bill.
  2R., *Aug. 2*, 466–470.
  Com., *Aug. 4*, 870; *Aug. 5*, 1111.
  Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1309, 1315.

St. Etienne
Trade Report Presented, *Aug. 2*, 396.

St. Katherine's Hospital, Regents Park
Endowments, Reforms in Administration of, etc.—Opportunity for Discussion.
  Qs. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 999, 1000.

Sale of Butter Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084

Salisbury, Marquis of—*Lord Privy Seal.*
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 42.
Licensing Bill.
  2R., *Aug. 1*, 227–242, 243, 247, 249; *Aug. 2*, 485.
  Com., *Aug. 4*, 855, 860–862, 868, 869, 872, 875, 876, 885–890, 902, 927, 932–935, 940–942, 945, 946; *Aug. 5*, 1106, 1107, 1109, 1111, 1113, 1121, 1124, 1125, 1127–1134, 1137, 1139, 1140.
  Aug. 5, 1143, 1147, 1149, 1151, 1156, 1185, 1192, 1195, 1196, 1198, 1201–1203, 1206, 1207.
  Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1287, 1288, 1290, 1294, 1305, 1306, 1309–1311, 1314, 1317, 1318, 1320, 1321, 1323–1325.
  3R., *Aug. 9*, 1514-1520.
Savings Bank, Post Office—Deposits, Particulars as to Investments of, *Aug. 5*, 1097.
Unclaimed Dividends, Appropriation of, towards Budget Deficit, *July 29*, 42.

Salmon Fisheries
Ireland—Boyne River, Close Season in—Assimilating Dates in Different Districts, proposed.
  Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 274.

Salop, County of
Parliamentary By-election for Western or Oswestry Division—New Member Sworn, *Aug. 1*, 284.

Samuel, Mr. H. L. [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Criminal Aliens Bill, Facilities for Taking, *Aug. 9*, 1690.
New Guinea, British—Service of Civil Servants previous to Transfer of Territory to Australia, Inclusion of, in computing Pensions, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 264.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*cont.*
Post Office Wages—Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug. 9*, 1617.
Shop Hours Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 5*, 1270.
Uganda Railway, Reasons for Raising further Money for, *Aug. 2*, 666.
Workmen's Compensation Act, Amendment of—Date of Presenting Committee Report, Possibility of Introducing Legislation this Session, etc., *Aug. 1*, 271.

Samuel Mr. S. M. [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 8*, 1481.
Exchequer Bonds, Treasury Borrowings on, *Aug. 8*, 1482.

Sandgate Homes
Pauper Inmates—Number, Complaints, Number Chargeable to each Metropolitan Union, Amount paid per head, etc.—Return Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1331.

Sandys, Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
Army Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1457, 1458.
Militia Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1455, 1456.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Anderson, Constable, Charges against and Dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 736–745.
Doohoma School, Illtreatment of Children at, by Master, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 533.
Kerry—Tenants Evicted by Land Commission, Compassionate Payment to, by Congested Districts Board, *Aug. 2*, 532.
Roundstone—Display of Flags on Licensed Premises, Illegal prohibition of, by Constabulary, alleged, Complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc., *Aug. 3*, 743, 744.
Under-Secretary for Ireland—Reasons for Appointment of Sir A. McDonnell, *Aug. 3*, 737, 738.

Savannah
Trade Report Presented, *July 29*, 3.

Savings Banks
Naval—Account of Deposits, etc., Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1332.
Post Office.
  Business.
    Amount of, in 1903 and first six months of 1904, Particulars as to, Reason for Liabilities Exceeding Assets, etc.
      Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 1*, 255, 270.

[*cont.*

Savings Banks—*cont.*
Post Office—*cont.*
Business—*cont.*
Shops, Number of, Conducting.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 29*, 83.

Deposits.

Books, Annual Examination of—Number of Depositors Failing to Forward Books.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 2*, 514.

Falling off in.
O. Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 3*, 819.

Investment of, Particulars as to.
Q. Earl Beauchamp; *A.* Marquess of Salisbury, *Aug. 5*, 1096, 1097.

Sums under One Pound, Number of, Deposited Annually.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley *July 29*, 83.

Murray, Mr., Superannuation of—Application for Reinstatement, etc.
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Lord Stanley *Aug. 9*. 1552, 1553,

Report, Date of Presenting.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 1*, 255, 270.

Withdrawals, Number of, during 1903.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley *July 29*, 82.

Savings Banks Acts Amendment Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Scariff River, Ireland
Drainage of, Proposed—Examination of River, etc,.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Aug. 4*, 968, 969.

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]
India—Village Police, Recommendations of Committee, Report as to, *Aug. 2* 520.

Scotch Education Department Provisional Order Confirmation (Edinburgh) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Scotland
Secretary—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Advocate—Mr. C. Scott-Dickson.
Lord Justice-General—Lord Kinross.
Vice-President of the Council of Education—Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Scotland—*cont.*
Chanonry Ferry, Closing of—Inconvenience to Public, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 1*, 257.

Congested Districts Board, *see that title.*

Crofters, *see under title* Highlands and Islands of Scotland.

Durness—Dismissal of Parish Doctor by Parish Council, Expenses of Reinstatement, Protection of Medical Officers, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 1*, 258; *Aug. 3*, 709, 710.

Edinburgh, *see that title.*

Education, *see that title*—Scotland.

Estimates, *see under* Civil Service Estimates.

Fisheries, *see that title.*

Free Church *v.* Lord Overtoun, House of Lords Judgment on case of—Statement as to proposed Legislative Action, etc.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 3*, 733, 734

Glasgow, *see that title.*

Harris—Parochial Medical Officers, Inaccuracies in Return as to, alleged.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 5*, 1213, 1214.

Highlands and Islands, *see that title.*

Lerwick, Naval Visit to, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 4*, 975.

Lewis, Island of, *see that title.*

Lochcarron Water Supply, Improvement of, Progress in.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 1*, 256.

Manufactures, Board of, Constitution and Work of—Inquiry into, proposed.
Os. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell, *Aug. 9*, 1568–1570; Mr. A. G. Murray, 1571, 1572; Mr. Ure, 1578, 1579; Mr. Bryce, 1583, 1584.

Medical Examination of School Children—Carrying out Recommendations of Physical Deterioration Committee.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592, 1593; Mr. S. Dickson, 1595.

Medical Officers, *see under title* Poor Law.

National Gallery, Date of taking Vote for.
Q. Sir J. Stirling Maxwell; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *July 29*, 80, 81.

Poor Law, *see that title.*

Post Office, *see that title.*

Railways, *see that title.*

Ross-shire Regiments, Depôt of, Under Army Reform Proposals.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug.* 1, 264.

[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*

Tain, Extra Charge on Letters addressed to Post Office at.
  Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 2*, 514; *Aug. 3*, 719.

Trawling, *see that title.*

Tuberculosis, Steps taken to Prevent Spread of.
  O. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592.

Ullapool, Establishment of Naval Reserve Station at, Progress of, etc.
  Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 1*, 259.

Vaccination, *see that title.*

Sea Fisheries

Proceedings at Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under Act of 1888—Report presented, *Aug. 5*, 1095.

Sea Fisheries Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

l. Report from Select Committee, Tabling, with Minutes of Evidence, *Aug. 8*, 1378.

Seamen

see under Merchant Shipping *and* Navy.

Secondary and Technical Education
see under Education.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Mr. Alfred Lyttelton.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Marquess of Lansdowne.

Secretary of State for India
Mr. W. St. John Brodrick.

Secretary for Scotland
Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Secretary of State for War
Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Selborne, Earl of—*First Lord of the Admiralty*].

Army Council Bill, 2R. *July 29*, 73, 74.

Battleships—"Lord Nelson" Class, Information as to Design of, *Aug. 9*, 1531.

Boilers, Belleville, Results of Experiments with, Cost of Repairs, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1534.

Comparison of British Fleets with those of Foreign Countries, Futility of, *Aug. 9*, 1531 1532.

Expenditure, Increase in, *Aug. 9*, 1527.

Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 41.

Guns, Mountings for, Time required for Construction of, *Aug. 9*, 1530–1531.

Importance of the Navy to the Maintenance of the Empire, *Aug. 9*, 1528.

Selborne, Earl of—*cont.*

Malta Harbour, Improvement of, progress made in construction of breakwater, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1096.

Militia Reform Proposal, *July 29*, 66.

Reserve, Increase in, steps taken to further, *Aug. 9*, 1536.

Russo-Japanese War, Lessons of, *Aug. 9*. 1533, 1535, 1536.

Scouts, Speed of, Coal capacity, etc., *Aug 9*, 1532, 1533.

Shipbuilding—Type of New Battleships, increased cost and size, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1530.

Submarines, Value of, for offensive and defensive purposes, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1533, 1534.

Two-Power Standard, origin and definition of, *Aug. 9*, 1528.

Works, Expenditure on—Information as to Class of Works, etc., *Aug.9*, 1535.
  Simon's Bay, Expenditure on Works at, *Aug. 9*, 1535.

Selby Urban District Council Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *July 29*, 1.
  3R.* *Aug. 2*, 393.
c. Lords' Amendts., *con.** *Aug. 8*, 1329.

Select Committees

Number Appointed in Sesssion 1904, Subjects of Inquiry, Names of Members, etc.—Return Ordered, *Aug. 2*, 511; presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.

Seton-Karr, Sir H. [St. Helens]

Lagos—Wild animals and birds, protection of—Restrictions on sale of guns and powder to the natives, *Aug. 8*, 1347.

Shackleton, Mr. D. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe.]

Cotton Industry.
  Machinery, unguarded, accidents due to—Enforcing regulations, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1019.
  Overtime work in factories, inadequate nature of penalties imposed for, *Aug. 4*, 1018.
  Weaving sheds, condition of—Failure of employer to comply with Home Office Regulations, *Aug. 4*, 1016–1018.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Act relating to Flax and Linen Industry in Ireland, Omission of, from Schedule, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1702.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.]

Mohill, evicted tenant at—Application from J. Maguire for reinstatement, *Aug. 1*, 275.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, S.]

Boyne River, close season for salmon fishing —Assimilating dates in different districts, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 274.

Shipman, Dr. T. G. [Northampton]
Wheat, Imported—Price, duty, etc., in United Kingdom, France, Germany and Italy in June and July 1904, *July 29*, 84; *Aug. 8*, 1336.

Shoddy Factories.
Machinery, etc., Inspection of—Return presented, *July* 29, 80.

Shop Hours Bill.
c. Con., *Aug. 5*, 1269.
Date of taking.
Os. Mr. Bryce, Mr. Whitley, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Lough, *Aug. 4*, 1001. 1002.
Proceeding with, proposed.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Aug. 2*, 652; Mr. Whitley, 653; Mr. W. Churchill, 654; Sir E. Gray, 656.

Shops.
Inspectors appointed under Acts, Number of, etc.,—Return presented, *July 29*, 79.

Shuttleworth, Lord.
Licensing Bill.
2R. *Aug. 1*, 201-208, 211.
Com., *Aug. 5*, 1146, 1149.

Sidmouth, Viscount.
Malta Harbour, improvement of, progress made in Construction of breakwater etc., *Aug. 5*, 1095.

Sievier v. Duke.
Inspector subpœnaed to give evidence as to character of the Plaintiff—Objections to practice.
Os. Mr. Atherley-Jones, *Aug. 4*, 1049, 1050; Mr. A. Douglas, 1049.

Simon's Bay.
Naval Works at, Expenditure on.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Aug. 9*, 1522; Earl of Selborne, 1535.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford].
Home Office, Functions of, Review of, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1050.
Savings Bank, Post Office—Mr. Murray, Superannuation of, and application for reinstatement, *Aug. 9*, 1552.

Site for Duke of York's School Bill.
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 8*, 1487.

Sittings of the House.
Number of days on which House sat in Session 1904; Total number of hours and average time occupied, etc., Return ordered, *Aug. 2*, 511; presented, *Aug. 3*, 707.

Skewes-Cox, Mr. T. [Surrey, Kingston]
Postmarks, Illegibility of, *Aug. 8*, 1354.

Slack, Mr. B. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]
Education—Religious Instruction—right of Parents to nominate instructor, *Aug. 8*, 1338.
Government Offices—weekly half holiday in all offices, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 261.
Metropolitan Police—Rent Allowance, Regulations as to, *Aug. 4*, 981.
Whitstable Charities Scheme, Provisions of—Local opposition, etc, *Aug. 2*, 540.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Africa, South—British Banks in—Claims for Specie commandeered by late South African Republic. *Aug. 4*, 998; *Aug. 8*, 1375.
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Information as to literature supplied to Village libraries, *Aug. 8*, 1361.
Armagh—Flags displayed on licensed premises, Prohibition of, by Constabulary, etc., *Aug. 3*, 715.
Ballynahinch.
Liquor, Illegal sale of, in, alleged, *Aug. 1*, 263.
River, Illegal netting in—Belfast Anglers' Association rights, etc., *Aug. 4*, 989.
Belfast Post Office.
Cloak Room Accommodation, Extension of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1566.
Garfield Street Office, Improvement in late fee box at, *Aug. 3*, 732.
Sorters, Illness of, and Accidents to—Regulations as to Sick Leave, Medical Attendance, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1565, 1566.
Sorting Office, Improvement in, *Aug. 9*, 1552.
Telegraph service—Messengers, Rate of pay of, *Aug 3*, 723.
Constabulary, Royal Irish.
Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 770, 771.
Prisoners, Testimony of Police as to Characters of, *Aug. 5*, 1217.
Retirement, Regulations as to, *Aug. 5*, 1216.
Rowndstone—Display of flags on licensed premises, Illegal prohibition of, by Constabulary, Complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc., *Aug. 1*, 272; *Aug. 4*, 954.
Cookstown Disturbances, Inquiry as to, *Aug. 8*, 1360.
Dromore and Dromara District—Payment to Petty Sessions Clerk for Committal of Lunatics, *Aug. 4*, 969.
Dublin—Rev. R. D. Patterson, Annoyance of, in public streets, *Aug. 3*, 771.

Sloan, Mr. T. H.—*cont.*
Liquor Licencing, etc.,—Six Day Licence, Extension of and rescinding of order, Action as to, *Aug. 3*, 715.
National School Teachers.
Dismissals, Regulations as to, *Aug. 9*, 1565.
Promotions of Male Principal Teachers since 1903, *Aug. 2*, 520.
Reports, Regulations as to marking "Excellent" by Inspectors, *Aug. 4*, 970; *Aug. 8*, 1344.
School, Roll No. 8145, Delay in Increment of Salary of Teacher, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 520.
Telegraph Service.
Belfast—Messengers, Rate of Pay of, *Aug. 3*, 733.
Telegraphists — Unestablished operators on temporary work, Payment regulations for, *Aug. 4*, 1984.

Smallpox
Ireland—Powers of Local Authorities to make bye-laws under Public Health Act.
Qs. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 276, 277.

Soares, Mr. E. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1221, 1225.
Clause I, Division of, into three—Instruction to Committee not in Order, *Aug. 5*, 1219.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1276.
Venezuela—Tariffs—Differential Surtax, question of, *Aug. 4*, 978.
Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug. 3*, 808.

Solicitor General
Sir E. Carson.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. J. H. M. Campbell.

Solicitors Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*, 1084.

Somaliland
Supplementary Estimates for, date of introduction of.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *Aug. 2*, 556.

Soudan
Civil Service, Regulations for entering.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4*, 976.
Niger and Lake Chad Boundary Commission, Work of, Cost, etc.
Q Mr. Norman; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 9*, 1557; *Q.* Mr. Norman; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 9*, 1558.

South Africa
see Africa, South.

South African War.
Expenditure on, and Conduct of—Breaches of Regulations and Unconstitutional Practices, etc.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1678, 1679; Mr. McKenna, 1680, 1681; Mr. Brodrick, 1681, 1682; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1682; Mr. S. Buxton, 1683.
Horses, Sale of, on conclusion of the War Prices obtained, etc.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1679; Mr. Brodrick, 1681, 1682; Mr. B. Davenport, 1686.
Memorial—Erection of Archway at eastern end of Mall extension, proposed.
Q. Sir E. Durning-Lawrence; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *Aug. 3*, 714.
Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteer Officers—Number serving in, Number granted Honorary Army Rank, etc.
Q. Sir Lees Knowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1350.
Transvaal Contribution, Absence of Provision for, in Estimates.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 1*, 269, 270.
Trophies—Allotment of guns.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1345.

South Shields Gas Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 2*, 505.

Southwell, Lord, Limerick Estate of
Sale of, Information as to.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 729.

Spain
Trade Reports Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1095.

Speaker
Absence of, Owing to Indisposition, *Aug. 5*, 1209.
Deputy.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill—Instruction to Committee to divide Clause 1 into three, not in Order, *Aug. 5*, 1219, 1220.
Members Named for Disregarding the Authority of the Chair, and requested to Leave the House, *Aug. 5*, 1266, 1267.
Motion for Adjournment of the House not in Order, *Aug. 5*, 1269.
Referring in one Debate to another just closed, *Aug. 5*, 1271.
Interruptions to Debate, *Aug. 1*, 374.
Irrelevant Observations, *Aug. 2*, 524, 530, 537; *Aug. 3*, 821.
Motion that the Question be now put—Members still wanting to Speak, *Aug. 2*, 586, 594.

[*cont.*

Speaker—*cont.*
- One Member rising to Speak during the course of another Member's Speech, *Aug. 1*, 374.
- Questions.
  - Answers to.
    - Debate on, Inadmissible, *Aug. 3*, 725.
    - Previous, Discussion of, *Aug. 1*, 266.
  - Supplementary, after those on the Paper have been Answered, *Aug. 2*, 526; *Aug. 8*, 1360.
- Post Office Sites Bill, Proposals as to Re-committment of, *Aug. 2*, 541.
- Twelve o'clock Rule, Suspension of—Motion to exempt Fridays, *Aug, 2*, 586.

Spencer, Earl
- Army Council Bill.
  - 2R., *July 29*, 71, 74.
  - *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 840, 841.
- Finance Bill.
  - 1R., *July 29*, 4, 8, 18.
  - 2R., *July 29*, 30.
  - Inadequate Opportunity for Discussion of—Objections to Suspension of Standing Order 39, *July 29*, 4–7.
- Financial Position of the Country—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, *July 29*, 30–32.
- Licensing Bill.
  - 2R., *Aug. 2*, 398–408.
  - *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 854, 855, 918–920, 945, 946; *Aug. 5*, 1114, 1128, 1139, 1167–1169, 1192, 1197.
  - Rep., *Aug. 8*, 1289, 1302, 1308, 1311, 1313, 1318, 1322.
  - 3R., *Aug. 9*, 1497–1502, 1519.
- Macedonia — Reorganisation of *Gendarmerie*—Position of Affairs, Increase in Number of Austrian and Russian Officers, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1099.
- Militia Reform Proposals, *July 29*, 50.
- Navy.
  - Battleships, Type of—Increased Size and Cost, *Aug. 9*, 1538.
  - Water-tube Boilers, Results of Experiments with, *Aug. 9*, 1537.
  - Works, Increase in Expenditure on, *Aug. 9*, 1538.

Spencer, Rt. Hon. C. R. [Northants, Mid.]
- Volunteers—Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1435, 1436.

Spirits
- Bond, Removals from—Regulations as to Permits, Excise Control over Spirits after Removal, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 4*, 980, 981.

Spirits—*cont.*
- Distilleries, British, Production of, in 1901, 1902, 1903, Particulars as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug.* 260, 261.

Staffordshire
- County Court of—Order of the Lord Chancellor that the Registrar, George Walton Walker, shall not practice as a Solicitor, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1333.

Standing Orders
- Alterations in, rendered Necessary by Transference of a Department from Board of Trade to Board of Agriculture.
  - *Os.* Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Aug. 9*, 1489–1495; Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1541–1546.
- Compliance with, Admission of Affidavits in Proof of—Standing Order 77, *Aug. 9*, 1493.

Stanhope, Earl
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*. 462–466.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*Postmaster-General* [Lancashire, Westhoughton]
- Carless, Mr., Reinvestigation of Case of, *Aug. 9*, 1630.
- Civil Servants' Hours of Attendance under Order in Council, August 1890, Provisions as to Extra Annual Leave, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1552.
- Counter Clerks in London, Checking Stocks of, *Aug. 9*, 1562.
- Grievances—Political Pressure upon Members of Parliament by Post Office Employees, *Aug. 9*, 1632.
- Inspection of Premises for Sanitary Purposes, Regulations as to, *Aug. 9*, 1631.
- Ireland.
  - Ballymoney, Post Office Business at, *Aug. 4*, 965.
  - Bangor, Post Office Business at, Increase in Accommodation, etc., *Aug. 4*, 965, 996.
  - Belfast.
    - Cloak-room Accommodation, Extension of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1566.
    - Garfield Street Office, Improvements in Posting Arrangements at, *Aug. 3*, 732.
    - Sorters, Illness of and Accidents to—Regulations as to Medical Attendance, Sick Leave, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1566.
    - Sorting Office, Improvement in, Ventilation of, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1552.

[*cont.*

Stanley, Right Hon. Lord—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Belfast—*cont.*
    - Staff, Increase of, at Stamp Counter, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 731, 732.
  - Dublin Sorting Office Defalcations—Corcoran Case, *Aug. 3*, 733.
  - Edgeworthstown — Retiring Allowance to Post Office Assistant, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 515.
  - Irishtown, Additional Facilities for, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 966.
  - Lavagh, Additional Postal Facilities for, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1370.
  - Portrush, Post Office Business at, *Aug. 4*, 965.
  - Town Sub-Postmasters, Increase of Salaries alleged to be Withheld from, Report on, in 1902, Receipt of, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1371.
- Leeds—Telegraph Superintendents' Survey Branch, Filling Vacancy in, *Aug. 2*, 515.
- Letters—Public Holidays.
  - Obtaining Letters Free of Charge by Calling at Post Offices, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 719.
  - Special Deliveries on, Revenue derived from Extra Charge for, *Aug. 3*, 711.
- Parcel Post — Transvaal, Prohibition of Despatch of Gold Goods to, by Transvaal authorities, *Aug. 3*, 719.
- Post Office Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 159.
- Post Office Sites Bill.
  - *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1275.
  - Re-commitment, Proposals as to, *Aug 2*, 541.
- Postmarks, Illegibility of, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 711; *Aug. 8*, 1344.
- Postmasters.
  - Assistant, Class of Officials designated as, Alleged Grievances of, etc., *Aug. 4*, 965.
  - Sub-Postmasters, Irishtown, Increase of Salaries alleged to be Withheld from, Report on, in 1902, Receipt of, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1371.
- Postmen.
  - Auxiliary, Improvement in Position of, *Aug. 9*, 1631.
  - Christmas Boxes to, Abolition of, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1634.
  - Glasgow Assistant Postmen, Accelerating Promotion of, *Aug. 9*, 1551.
  - Wages, *see that subheading.*
- Report of Postmaster-General, Date of Issue of, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1562.

Stanley, Right Hon. Lord—*cont.*
- Savings Bank.
  - Business.
    - Amount of, in 1903 and first six months of 1904, Particulars as to, Reason for Liabilities exceeding Assets, etc., *Aug. 1*, 255, 270.
    - Shops, Number of, Conducting, *July 29*, 83.
  - Deposits.
    - Books, Annual Examination of—Number of Depositors failing to Forward Books, *Aug. 2*, 514.
    - Sums under One Pound, Number of, Deposited Annually, *July 29*, 83.
  - Murray, Mr., Superannuation of, and Application for Reinstatement, *Aug. 9*, 1553.
  - Report, Date of Presenting, *Aug.* 1, 255, 270.
  - Withdrawals, Number of, etc., during 1903, *July 29*, 82.
- Scotland.
  - Glasgow—Assistant Postmen, Accelerating Promotion of, *Aug. 9*, 1551.
  - Tain, Extra Charge on Letters addressed to Post Office at, *Aug. 2*, 514; *Aug. 3*, 719.
- Sorter Tracers in London, Reply to Memorial from, *Aug. 3*, 711.
- Sorters.
  - Illness of, and Accidents to— Regulations as to Medical Attendance, Sick Leave, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1566.
  - Stolen Overcoats, Compensation for *Aug. 5*, 1212.
- Telegraph Service.
  - Explosions caused by Leakage from Wires, *Aug. 9*, 1551.
  - Ireland.
    - Belfast—Rate of Pay of Messengers, *Aug. 3*, 733.
    - Telegrams, Free Delivery of, to whole Village, if part of it be within the Statutory Limit, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 966.
  - Leeds—Filling Vacancy in Superintendents' Survey Branch, *Aug. 2*, 515.
  - Telegraphists—Unestablished operators on temporary work during season months, Payment for, *Aug. 4*, 984.
- Telephone Service.
  - Contracts—Plant—Orders given to British and foreign firms respectively, *July 29*, 82.
  - Explosions caused by Leakage of Electricity from Wires, *Aug. 9*, 1551.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
Telephone Service—*cont.*
National Telephone Company, Progress of Negotiations with *Aug.* 8, 1353.
Trunk System—Six minute calls from 8.p.m. on Saturdays to 8. a.m. on Mondays, proposed, *Aug.* 8, 1340.
Wages.
Bradford Committee Report and Recommendations, *Aug* 9, 1606, 1614, 1615, 1630.
Discussion of, Opportunity for, etc., *Aug.* 3, 735, 736 ; *Aug.* 4, 984.
Christmas Boxes, Abolition of, proposed *Aug.* 9, 1634.
Population as a Basis for Calculating, *Aug.* 9, 1635.
Wapping—Establishment of Post Office west of Wapping Bridge, proposed, *July*, 29, 82.
Women employed, Inadequate Salaries paid to, *Aug.* 9, 1635.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
Licensing Bill.
Com., *Aug.* 4, 862, 863, 866, 867, 872, 873, 875, 900–903, 927, 932, 935 ; *Aug.* 5, 1111, 1113, 1121, 1139, 1146, 1148, 1149, 1153, 1189.
Rep. *Aug.* 8, 1287, 1290, 1299, 1305, 1312, 1319, 1320.

Starvation
London, Number of Deaths in—Return presented, *July* 29, 79.

Statistics
Abstracts.
British Colonies, Possessions and Protectorates, for, from 1889 to 1903, presented, *Aug.* 9, 1495, 1547.
Foreign Countries, Principal and other, for, 1892–1902, presented, *July* 29, 4, 80.

Stirling - Maxwell, Sir J. M. [Glasgow, College]
Edinburgh.
Manufactures, Board of.
Inquiry into Constitution and Work of, proposed, *Aug.* 9, 1568–1570.
Sum of £2,000 misapplied by, *Aug.* 9, 1569, 1570, 1573.
National Art, and Portrait Galleries. Administration of — Report of Committee of Inquiry, *Aug.* 9, 1568.
Purchase of Pictures, Grants-in-aid of, *Aug.* 9, 1570.
National Gallery of Scotland, Date of taking Vote for, *July* 29, 80.

Strabane, Raphoe and Convoy Railway Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *July* 29, 77.

Stretford Urban District Council Bill.
c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *July* 29, 78.
Con.,* *Aug.* 4, 951.
3R.* *Aug.* 5, 1210.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *Aug.* 8, 1281.

Sugar
Brussels Convention, Working of.
O. Earl Beauchamp, *July* 29, 36.

Sullivan, Mr. D. [Westmeath, S.]
Royal Canal, Progress made in Dredging, *Aug.* 4, 997.

Superannuation
Army and Navy Officers permitted to hold Civil Employment of Profit under Public Departments — Return Presented, *Aug.* 8, 1286, 1332.

Supply
Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, Navy Estimates, *see those titles.*
Business of—Arrears and Inadequate Opportunity for Discussion.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug.* 2, 552, 553 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 553 ; Mr. Buchanan, 558, 559 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 579, 581.
Grant out of Consolidated Fund towards making good — Resolution in Committee of Ways and Means, *Aug.* 9, 1688.

Supply of Electricity Bill.
l. Com. and Rep.,* *Aug.* 8, 1328.
Minutes of Evidence Tabled, *Aug.* 8, 1287, 1378.

Surrey Commercial Dock Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *con.** *July* 29, 77.

Swindon Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July* 29, 2.
c. Lords' Amendts., *con.** *Aug.* 8, 1329.

Switzerland
International Labour Conference — Subjects to be dealt with, Appointment of British Delegates, etc.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug.* 4, 1008.

Tain
Post Office, Extra Charge on Letters addressed to.
Qs. Mr. Weir ; *As.* Lord Stanley, *Aug.* 2, 514 ; *Aug.* 3, 719.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
Licensing Bill, 3R., *July* 29, 142.
Locomotives, Damage caused by Sparks from, urging Railway Companies to take Measures to Prevent, proposed, *Aug.* 5, 1214.

Taxation
Increase in, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *July* 29, 25, 26.
Local Taxation, *see that title.*
Quantities taxed, Receipts, etc., Changes in, upon Acceptance of Budget Proposals — Return Presented, *Aug.* 8, 1332

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, East Toxteth]
  Ritualistic Practices—Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Aug. 1*, 281.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, Radcliffe]
  Common Lodging Houses, Sanitary Conditions of, *Aug. 4*, 1033, 1034.
  Cotton Industry — Unfenced Machinery, Accidents due to—Enforcing Regulations, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1032.
  Counterfeit Coins—Descriptions of Counterfeiting Process given in Newspapers, *Aug. 1*, 271; *Aug. 4*, 1034.
  Factories and Workshops—"Particulars," Falsification and Fraud as to, by Employers, *Aug. 4*, 1032, 1033.

Tea
  Additional 2d. per pound on, Burden imposed on the Poorer Classes by.
    References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *July 29*, 25, 30, 34.

Telegraph Service
  Explosions caused by Leakage of Electricity from Wires.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 9*, 1551.
  Ireland.
    Belfast—Messengers, Rate of Pay.
      Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 3*, 733.
    Telegrams—Free Delivery of, proposed, to whole Village if part of it be within the Statutory Limit.
      Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 966.
  Leeds—Superintendents' Survey Branch, Filling Vacancy in.
    Q. Mr. Barran; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 2*, 515.
  Telegraphists.
    Pay—Maximum Amount, Obstructions in the way of Obtaining, etc.
      Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug. 9*, 1604; Mr. Rutherford, 1616; Mr. Norman, 1628.
    Unestablished Operators sent to Offices in Consequence of Temporary Increase of Work, Pay of.
      Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 4*, 984.

Telegraph Vote
  Date of Taking.
  Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1375.

Telephone Service
  Contracts—Plant—Number of Orders given to British and Foreign Firms respectively.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 29*, 81, 82.

Telephone Service—*cont.*
  Explosions caused by Leakage of Electricity from Wires.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 9*, 1551.
  National Telephone Company, Progress of Negotiations with.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 8*, 1353.
  Trunk System—Six Minute Calls from 8 p.m. on Saturdays to 8 a.m. on Mondays, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Brotherton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 8*, 1340.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
  Children, Employment of—Rules to be submitted to Local Authorities, Progress made with, *Aug. 4*, 1009.
  Electrical Trades—Laxity in Enforcing Home Office Regulations, *Aug. 4*, 1012, 1013.
  Factories and Workshops.
    Sanitary Conditions, Physical Condition of Workers, etc., *Aug. 4*, 1009, 1010.
    Women.
      Employment of, before, and after Confinement—Steps taken to Enforce the Law, *Aug. 4*, 1010.
      Inspectors, Work done by, Tributes to, *Aug. 4*, 1010.
  Infant Mortality—Steps taken to deal with, *Aug. 4*, 1010.
  Horse-hair Industry, Increase in Cases of Anthrax among Workers in—Scheduling as Dangerous Trade, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 1013.

Thames
  Barrage Scheme—Inquiry as to Practicability of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 29*, 81.
  Steamers, Liquor Traffic on—Introduction of Legislation to Restrict, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 254.

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.**, *July 29*, 77.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate
  Sale of, Particulars of.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 987.

Thurles Urban District Council Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 1*, 161, 251.

Tibet Expedition
  Tibetans, losses of, Information as to.
    Qs. Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *Aug. 1*, 268.

Tidal Lands
Acquisition of—Deposit of Copies of plans and sections—Standing Order relating to, *Aug. 9*, 1490.

Tireragh District, Co. Sligo
Railway, Petition for construction of.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 1*, 274, 275.

Tobacco Duties
Anticipations of the Budget, Inquiry into, proposed.
References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July, 29*, 32, 33.
Protective character of.
References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *July, 29*, 27, 28, 30, 31, 38.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
Animals, Experiments on—Increase in Vivisection experiments, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 517.

Tomlinson, Sir W. E. M. [Preston]
University of Liverpool Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 159.

Torquay Tramways Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.**, *July, 29*, 77.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Bury, Lancashire]
Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug. 2*, 667.

Trade, Board of
President—Mr. Gerald W. Balfour.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. A. Bonar Law.
Labour Department—Wages, Rates of, and Hours of Labour, Changes in—Report with Comparative Statistics for 1894–1902, presented, *July 29*, 3.
Tramways Act of 1870—Report of Proceedings under, presented, *July 29*, 3, 80.

Trade and Commerce
Disputes, Commission on, Particulars as to proceedings of.
Qs. Mr. Bell; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 521; *Aug. 8*, 1348.
Fiscal Blue Book, Revised edition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 957.
Non-employment in skilled and unskilled trades of the principal industrial countries, Statistics as to.
Q. Sir E. Vincent; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 517.

Trade Reports
Annual Series presented, *July 29*, 3; *Aug. 1*, 253; *Aug. 2*, 396, 509; *Aug. 5*, 1095, 1211; *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1332; *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.

Trade Unions
Funds, Protection of—Introduction of legislation next session, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 8*, 1348.

Trafford Park Bill
*c. Con.** *Aug. 2*, 507.
3R.* *Aug, 5*, 1209.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Training Colleges
see under Education.

Tramways
Board of Trade Proceedings under Act of 1870—Report presented, *July 29*, 3, 80.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
c. Rep * *Aug. 3*, 706.
3R.* *Aug. 4*, 951.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. Rep.* *Aug. 3*, 705.
*Con.** *Aug. 4*, 951.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1210.
l. Commons' Amendments. *Con.** *Aug.* 1281.

Transvaal
British Indian subjects, Trading rights of.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 9*, 1559.
Chinese Labour, Importation of.
Offices, Depôts, etc.—Authority responsible for cost of erecting depôts.
Qs. Mr. Whitley, Mr. S. Buxton; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 1*, 266, 267.
Recruiting in China, Method of—Inquiry as to statements of Rev. Arnold-Forster, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 1*, 268.
Financial condition of—War Contribution, Absence of provision for payment of first instalment of.
O. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 29*, 39, 43.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 1*, 269, 270.
Johannesburg, Race troubles — Secret organisation to punish natives assaulting white people, alleged, Inquiry as to, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 1*, 267.
Post Office Parcel Post—Prohibition of gold goods by Transvaal Authorities.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Aug. 3*, 718, 719.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Railways—Imperial Railways taken over by the Military during the War—Price paid, Authority responsible for, etc.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Aug. 9*, 1632; Mr. S. Buxton, 1684; Mr. B. Davenport, 1685.
Representative government, proposals as to.
Os. Lord Coleridge, *Aug. 5*, 1101; Duke of Marlborough, 1103; Marquess of Ripon, 1104.
Discussing in Parliament, Opportunity for.
O. Marquess of Ripon *Aug. 5*, 1104.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Bryce, Mr. W. Churchill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, 524–527.
Procedure, precedent for.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 4*, 1000, 1001.
Stores, Sale of, allegations against Col. Morgan, etc., Date of War Office Inquiry.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Aug. 9*, 1679; Mr. M'Kenna, 1680.

Trawling
Illegal.
Ireland—Belfast Lough, in, alleged.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 3*, 720, 721.
Legislation of a more deterrent nature, introduction of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 3*, 709.
"Jackal" employment of, in International North Sea Investigations instead of in protection of fishermen from illegal trawling.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *Aug. 3*, 709.

Travers Foundation
Statement of estimated Expenditure for 1904–5, approved, *Aug. 8*, 1488.

Treasury
First Lord—Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Trench, Mr. B. B., Estate of
Evicted Tenant, Mrs. Kennedy, reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 4*, 988.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
Committee, Rule as to number of times a Member may speak in, *Aug. 2*, 655.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P.—*cont.*
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1239.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1277.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1274.

Trinity College, Dublin
Irish Church Act, Receipts under—particulars as to Expenditure.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *Aug. 2*, 533, 534.

Tristan d'Acunha, Island of
White Inhabitants of—Progress of arrangements for removal to Cape Colony.
Q. Mr. Fuller; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Aug. 1*, 267, 268.

Truck Act
Breaches of—Further Legislation required.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 4*, 1007; Mr. A. Douglas, 1040.

Tuberculosis
Scotland—Steps taken to prevent spread of disease.
O. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1592.

Tully, Mr. J. [Leitrim, S.]
Constabulary, Royal Irish—Number of Recruits for year ended 31st March, 1904, *Aug. 3*, 726.
Dillon Estate, Sale of—Progress of negotiations, *Aug. 8*, 1363.
Labourers' Cottages, Occupation of, by other than *bonâ fide* Labourers, prevention of—Number of Complaints, etc., *Aug. 3*, 727.
Land Purchase—Tenants for life, judicia decision as to payment of Bonus to, under Section 48—Number of Sales postponed or abandoned in consequence of decision, *Aug. 4*, 987.
Local Government Board, Ireland—Information as to surcharges, *Aug. 3*, 726; *Aug. 8*, 1363.
Macroom Union, Decision as to Clerkship of, *Aug. 3*, 727.

Turkey
Trade Report presented, *Aug. 9*, 1496.

Twelve o'Clock Rule
Suspension of, for remainder of Session.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug. 2*, 542; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 548; Sir C. Dilke, 550; Mr. G. Bowles, 554, 555; Mr. W. Churchill, 569.
Fridays, exemption of, proposed.
Os. Mr. E. Griffith, *Aug. 2*, 585, 586; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Lough, Mr. Delany, Mr. Moss, 587; Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. C. Warner, Mr. Labouchere, 588.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill
c. 3R.* *Aug. 1*, 251.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 2*, 393.

Uganda Railway
Capital expenditure, reasons for raising further money for.
Os. Mr. H. Samuel, *Aug. 2*, 666; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 667.

Ullapool
Naval Reserve Station, establishment of, progress in.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *Aug. 1*, 259.

United States of Ameria
Historical Manuscripts in Royal Institution of Great Britain, Report on, presented, *July 29*, 4, 79.
Irish-cured fish, Import duty on, negotiations as to reduction of, proposed.
Q. M. Ffrench; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 8*, 1353.
Trade Reports presented, *July 29*, 3.

Universities
Leeds University Bill, *see that title.*
Roman Catholic University for Ireland, *see under* Education—Ireland.
Trinity College Dublin, *see under* Dublin.

University of Liverpool Bill
c. *Com.*, *July 29*, 159.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 29*, 160.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 164.
2R.* *Aug. 2*, 397.
Com. and Rep.* *Aug. 4*, 844.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1095.

Ure, Mr. A. [Linlithgow]
Edinburgh.
Manufactures, Board of, Reconstitution of, *Aug. 9*, 1578, 1579.
National Art, and Portrait Galleries in—Administration, Changes in—Carrying out Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Aug. 9*, 1578.

Vaccination
Exemption Certificates, Difficulty in obtaining, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 8*, 1354, 1355.
Scotland.
Laws, Administration of.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1593; Mr. S. Dickson, 1596, 1597; Sir W. Foster, 1599.
Lymph, Supply of—Objections to use of Humanised Lymph.
Os. Mr. Weir, *Aug. 9*, 1593; Mr. S. Dickson, 1596; Sir W. Foster, 1598, 1599.

Valuation Bill
Abandonment of.
Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Aug. 2*, 559; Mr. Lloyd-George, 561.
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill withdrawn, *Aug. 4*; 1084.

Venezuela
Tariffs—Differential Surtax, Question of.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Earl Percy, *Aug. 4* 978.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
Army Reform Proposals, Decision as to, Method proposed to Arrive at, etc., *Aug. 2*, 538.
Fiscal Policy, Imperial Conference on, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1375.
Merchant Shipping.
Foreign Vessels plying to and from British Ports, Number of Life-saving Appliances carried, etc., *Aug. 3*, 713; *Aug. 8*, 1355.
Seamen—Engagements during June and July, Proportion of British to Foreign Sailors and Firemen, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1334, 1335.
Volunteers, Cost of, per head per Annum and Items upon which Reductions are proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1345.

Vincent, Sir E. [Exeter]
Trade—Non-employment in Skilled and Unskilled Trades of the principal Industrial Countries, Statistics as to, *Aug 2*, 517.

Vivisection
see Animals, Experiments on.

Volunteers
Compulsory Service, *see that title.*
Cost of, per head per Annum, and Items upon which Reductions are proposed.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1345.
Division of, into two classes, proposed.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1387; Mr. W. Churchill, 1417; Mr. C. R. Spencer, 1435.
Grants to, Increasing, in view of Efficiency, proposed.
O. Sir L. Knowles, *Aug. 8*, 1436.
Reform Proposals.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1386; Mr. W. Churchill, 1416–1418; Mr. C. R. Spencer, 1435, 1436.
South African War, Number Serving in, number granted honorary Army Rank, etc.
Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1350.

Wages
Rates of Change in—Report with comparative Statistics for 1894–1902, Presented, *July 29*, 3.

Waldegrave, Earl
Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Bill, *Com., July 29*, 77.

Wales
Carnarvonshire National Schools—Variations Sanctioned as to Foundation Managers.
Q. Mr. G. Kenyon ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *Aug. 9*, 1553.
Clocaenog Burial Dispute—Refusal of Parish Bier by Rector, alleged.
Qs. Mr. H. Roberts ; *As.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 2*, 528 ; *Aug. 9*, 1548, 1549.
Education, *see that title.*

Walker, George Walton
Registrar of County Court of Staffordshire—Order of the Lord Chancellor forbidding practice as a Solicitor, Presented, *Aug. 8*, 1286, 1333.

Wallace, Mr. R. [Perth]
Edinburgh, National Art Institutions in, Sites for Re-housing of, *Aug. 9*, 1586, 1587.
Education [Local Authority Default] Bill *Com., Aug. 5*, 1250, 1252.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1278.

Wapping
Post Office, Establishment of, west of Wapping Bridge, proposed.
Q. Sir T. Dewar ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *July 29*, 82.

War
see also titles, Russo-Japanese War, *and* South African War.
Wounded in Armies in the Field, Amelioration of Condition of—Accession of China to Geneva Convention, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.

War Office
Secretary of State—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Under-Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore
Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.
Statutory Powers of Secretary of State proposed to be Transferred to the Army Council.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 29*, 71 ; Earl Spencer, 72 ; Marquess of Ripon, *Aug. 4*, 841 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 842 ; Lord Monkswell, 843 ; Earl of Donoughmore, *Aug. 5*, 1208.
Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *July 29*, 89, 90.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Stafford, Lichfield]
Army
Artillery, delay in re-armament of, *Aug. 8*, 1470.
Reform Proposals, *Aug. 8*, 1469, 1470.
Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 8*, 1480.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T.—*cont.*
Committee of Defence, Constitution and Functions of, *Aug. 2*, 638–640.
Twelve O'Clock Rule, Suspension of, for remainder of Session—Exemption of Fridays, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 588.
Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug. 2*, 664, 665 ; *Aug. 8*, 1480, 1481.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Lerwick, Naval Visit to, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 975.
Physical Deterioration Committee Report—Adoption of Recommendations, *Aug. 1*, 270.
Poor Law Medical Officers.
Durness Medical Officer, dismissal of, by Parish Council—Expenses of reinstatement, protection of medical officers, etc., *Aug. 1*, 258 ; *Aug. 3*, 709.
Leave, Annual, Government provision for, in remote Scotch parishes, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 257.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Recruiting in China, Method of—Inquiry as to statement of Rev. Arnold Forster, *Aug. 1*, 268.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill
c. Rep.* *Aug. 3*, 705.
*Con.** *Aug. 4*, 951.
3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1210.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *Aug. 8*, 1281.

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, Tabling, with Minutes of Evidence, *Aug. 8*, 1378.

Wei-hai-Wei
Terms of holding, negotiations as to modification of.
Q. Mr. Norman ; *A.* Earl Percy *Aug. 9*, 1561.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty].
Africa, South, British Banks in, Committee to consider claims of, as to gold commandeered by late South African Republic, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 521.
Assam.
Cherra, Procedure in filling vacant siemship of, *Aug. 4*, 967.
Excessive sentence on Native at Dibrugarh, alleged, *Aug. 9*, 1556.
Chanonry Ferry, Closing of—Inconvenience to public, etc., *Aug 1*, 257.
Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, Date of proceeding with, *Aug. 2*, 539, 544.
Crofters Act, extension of, to small leaseholders in Highland Crofting Counties, proposed, *Aug. 2*, 516.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
- Edinburgh, Art Institutions in.
  - Fees charged, *Aug.* 9, 1589.
  - State Contributions towards upkeep of, *Aug.* 9, 1589.
- Egypt.
  - Army, Appointment of British officers in, alleged, *Aug.* 3, 712.
  - Arbitration Treaty between France and Great Britain — European Assent to Egyptian Clauses, ascertaining Egyptian opinion, etc., *Aug.* 8, 1351, 1352.
  - Crime in, Inquiry as to growth of, proposed, *Aug.* 8, 1352.
  - Finance.
    - *Caisse de la Dette*, period for termination of, *Aug.* 3, 718.
    - Proposals as to, *Aug.* 9, 1560.
  - Mecca Pilgrims, arrangements for safety of, *Aug.* 3, 718.
  - Orphans and Destitute Poor, Care of, Information as to, *Aug.* 5, 1213.
- Egyptian and Soudanese Civil Services, Regulations for entering, *Aug.* 4, 976.
- Highlands and Islands.
  - Deaths in, Number of uncertified, owing to insufficiency of Medical Men, etc., *Aug.* 9, 1591.
  - Graveyards in, neglected condition of, *Aug.* 9, 1592.
  - India—Agricultural Banks, number of, established, etc., *Aug.* 4, 968.
  - Army.
    - Equipment other than guns and rifles manufactured in India during the last two years, *Aug.* 4, 967.
    - Imperial Cadet Corps, members of Indian aristocracy in, number of commissions to be conferred annually, etc., *Aug.* 9, 1560.
  - Curzon, Lord, Departmental history of administration of, making public, proposed, *Aug.* 8, 1342.
  - India — Finance—Saving effected by loan of Indian troops for Imperial purposes, *Aug.* 9, 1559.
  - Government Departments, Salaries and distribution of work in—Return proposed, *Aug.* 8, 1351.
  - Irrigation—Recommendations of Commission, Adoption of, etc., *Aug.* 4, 968.
  - Police, Report on, Delay in Presenting proposals relative to, *Aug.* 4, 967.
- "Jackal," H.M.S., Employment of, on International North Sea Investigations, Reason for, etc., *Aug.* 3, 709.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
- Lewis Island of.
  - Cromore-Gravir Road, Delay in Construction of, *Aug.* 4, 957.
  - Houses in, Insanitary condition of, *Aug.* 9, 1591.
- Lochcarron Water Supply, Improvement of, Progress in, *Aug.* 1, 256.
- Medical Examination of School Children—Carrying out Recommendations of Physical Deterioration Committee, *Aug.* 9, 1592, 1593.
- Medical Officers.
  - Number Appointed without Public Health Diplomas, *Aug.* 9, 1592.
  - Return as to Local Officers, Inaccuracy of, *Aug.* 5, 1213; *Aug.* 9, 1593.
- Metropolitan Railways—Electric traction, Delay in Introducing, alleged, *July* 29, 83.
- Parliament—House of Commons, Ventilation of, Improvements in
  - Inlet fan, Particulars as to, *Aug.* 4, 985.
  - Tenders for supply of plant, names of firms making, *July* 29, 85.
- Physical Deterioration Committee Report—Adoption of Recommendarions, etc., *Aug.* 3, 720; *Aug.* 4, 985.
- Post Office.
  - Letters—Public Holidays.
    - Obtaining letters on, free of charge by calling at Post Offices proposed, *Aug.* 3, 719.
    - Special deliveries on—Revenue derived from—Extra Charge for letters, *Aug.* 3, 711.
  - Report of Postmaster-General, Date of Issue of, etc., *Aug.* 9, 1561.
- Ross-shire Regiments, Depôt of, under Army Reform proposals, *Aug.* 1, 264.
- Savings Bank, Post Office.
  - Deposits.
    - Books, Annual Examination of—Number of Depositors failing to forward books, *Aug.* 2, 514.
    - Sums under one pound, number of, received annually, *July* 29, 83.
  - Shops, Business conducted in, etc., *July* 29, 83.
  - Withdrawals, Number of, etc. during 1903, *July* 29, 82.
- Tain Post Office, extra charge on letters addressed to, *Aug.* 2, 514; *Aug.* 3, 719.
- Telephone Service—Progress of negotiations with National Telephone Company, *Aug.* 8, 1353.
- Trawling, Illegal—Legislation of more deterrent nature, proposed, *Aug.* 3, 709.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Tuberculosis, Steps taken to prevent spread of, *Aug.* 9, 1592.
Ullapool, Establishment of Naval Reserve station at, progress made in, etc., *Aug.* 1, 529.
Vaccination.
  Exemption certificates, difficulty in obtaining, alleged, *Aug.* 8, 1354.
  Lymph, humanised, objections to use of, in Scotland, *Aug.* 9, 1593.

Wemyss, Earl of
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug.* 4, 859, 925, 927; *Aug.* 5, 1125, 1194, 1207.
Militia Reform Proposals, *July* 29, 45, 51, 70.

West Indies
Clergy—Amount payable out of the Consolidated Fund for Ecclesiastical purposes—Return presented, *Aug.* 9, 1496, 1546.

West Riding Tramways Bill
c. 3R.*, *Aug.* 2, 507.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *Aug.* 4, 837.

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill
l. 1R.* *July*, 29, 77.
2R. *Aug.* 4, 844.
Com. and *Rep**., *Aug.* 5, 1095.
3R. *Aug.* 8, 1328.
c. 1R.* *Aug.* 9, 1567.

Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. L. [Yorkshire, W.R. Ripon]
Education, Elementary—Cost and percentage borne by local and Imperial funds from 1899–1902, *Aug.* 4, 960.

Wheat
Imported—Duties, price, etc., in United Kingdom, France, Germany and Italy, in, June and July, 1904.
  Qs. Dr. Shipman; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour, *July* 29, 84, *Aug.* 8, 1336, 1337.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug.* 5, 1265.

Whitley, Mr J. H. [Halifax]
Army—Sir C. Knox, and other Officers, Payment of Salaries to, after Disallowance by the Treasury, *Aug.* 9, 1686.
Capital Expenditure (Money) Bill, *Aug.* 8, 1481.
  Objections to taking Resolution after Twelve O'clock, *Aug.* 2, 653.
Chartered Company of South Africa, Vouchers for Payments to, *Aug.* 9, 1687.

Whitley, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
Committee of Defence—Secretary, Information as to Salary of, *Aug.* 2, 640.
Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug.* 5, 1221, 1235, 1239, 1261, 1262, 1264.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R, *Aug.* 4, 1081.
  Measures Smuggled through by means of, without discussion, *Aug.* 4, 1081.
Financial Position of the country, *Aug.* 3, 809–811.
Post Office Sites Bill.
  Com., *Aug.* 8, 1487.
  Proposals as to Re-commitment of, *Aug.* 2, 540, 541.
Public Accounts Committee Report, Criticisms on, *Aug.* 9, 1686.
Shop Hours Bill.
  Date of taking, *Aug.* 4, 1002.
  Proceeding with, proposed, *Aug.* 2, 653.
South African War Expenditure—Transvaal Contribution, Absence of provision for, in the Estimates, *Aug.* 1, 269.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Offices and Depôts—Authority responsible for Cost of Erecting Depôts, *Aug.* 1, 266, 267.
Works, Borrowings for, on Exchequer Bonds, *Aug.* 3, 809; *Aug.* 8, 1481.

Whitmore Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
Horton Lunatic Asylum, Mismanagement of, alleged– Inquiry proposed, *Aug.* 1, 259.

Whitstable.
Charities Scheme, Provisions of—Local opposition to, etc.
  Q. Mr. Slack; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Aug.* 2, 540.

Whittaker, Mr. T. P. [Yorkshire, W. R., Spen Valley.]
Licensing Bill, 3R., *July* 29, 101, 128.

Wild Birds Protection Acts Amendment (St. Kilda) Bill
l. *Com.* and Rep.* *July* 29, 74.
3R*, *Aug.* 4, 840.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
Dudley Temperance Meetings, Disturbances at, Police prevention of, etc., *Aug.* 5, 1211.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth]
Africa, South, Garrison in—Cost, etc., *Aug.* 8, 1346.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *Aug.* 5, 1278.

Wolff, Mr. G. W. [Belfast, E.]
Roman Catholic University for Ireland, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 798, 799.

Wolverton, Lord
Electric Lighting (London) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 397.

Woollen Factories
Machinery, etc., Inspection of—Return presented, *July 29*, 80.

Workhouses
Ireland—Female Inspectors, appointment of, proposed.
Qs. Lord Emly; *As.* Lord Ashbourne, *Aug. 8*, 1327, 1328.

Working Classes
Housing of, *see* Housing of the Working Classes.
Physical Deterioration Committee Report and Recommendations—Ventilation, and Rearing of Children, dissemination of information as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. W. Long *Aug. 3*, 720.

Workmen
Housing, Question, *see* Housing of the Working Classes.

Workmen's Compensation
Law relating to—Report of Committee of Inquiry as to, presented, *Aug. 2*, 395, 509.

Workmen's Compensation Act
Amendment of—Committee Report, date of presenting. Possibility of introducing legislation this Session, etc.,
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. A. A. Douglas, *Aug. 1*, 271.

Workmen's Trains
Report from Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, presented, *Aug. 3*, 736.

Works
First Commissioner—Lord Windsor.
Capital Expenditure on, Estimated amount of borrowings for.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 2*, 650; Mr. Buchanan, 664; Mr. Runciman, 665; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 3*, 816; Mr. W. Churchill, 817.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *Aug. 8*, 1481; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1482, 1483.
Ireland.
Debt due to Commisioners, Committee to consider authorising remission of, *Aug. 8*, 1488.
Report of Commissioners for Public Works, for 1904, presented, *Aug. 8*, 1285, 1332.
Naval, *see under* Navy.

Works—*cont.*
Treasury borrowings for, on terminable annuities—authorising borrowings on Exchequer Bonds.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Aug. 2*, 649–651, 663, 664; Mr. Buchanan, 663; Mr. Lyell, 664; Mr. C. Warner, 664, 665; Mr. Ainsworth, 666; Mr. Toulmin, 667.
Os. Mr. Soares, *Aug. 3*, 808; Mr. Whitley, 809–811; Sir M. H. Beach; 811, 812, 814; Mr. Lough, 813; Mr. McKenna, 813–815; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 815–817.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *Aug. 3*, 817–822; Mr. Whitley, *Aug. 8*, 1481; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1482, 1483.

Workshops
see Factories and Workshops.

Worsted Factories
Machinery, etc., Inspection of—Return presented, *July 29*, 80.

Wounded in War
Amelioration of condition of—Accession of China to Geneva Convention, *Aug. 9*, 1496, 1547.

Wylie, Mr. A. [Dumbartonshire]
Edinburgh, Art Institutions in, State contributions towards upkeep of, etc., *Aug. 9*, 1581, 1582.

Wyndham, Right Hon. G.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover]
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department.
Libraries, Village, Information as to literature supplied to, *Aug. 8*, 1361.
Veterinary Branch.
Clerks, reply to memorial from, *Aug. 4*, 995.
Promotions, Information as to, *Aug. 8*, 1366.
Salaries of Transferred Clerks, *Aug. 8*, 1367.
Antrim—Shaftesbury, Earl of, sale of estates of—Price asked, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1365.
Ardagh Burial ground, new, Loan for completion of—Decision of Local Government Board, *Aug. 1*, 277.
Armagh.
Flags displayed on licensed premises, prohibition of, by Constabulary, *Aug. 3*, 715.
Poor Law Officials.
Assistant teacher and Catechist, abolition of office of, Pension granted to Miss M'Kee, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1218.
Religious denominations of, *Aug. 5*, 1218.

cont.]

Wyndham, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*

- Athenry, Graig Abbey—Purchase of grazing lands to enlarge uneconomic holding, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 995.
- Athlone—Bog in Parish of St. John's, purchase of, by Congested Districts Board—Turbary rights of former tenants, *Aug. 8*, 1343.
- Ballymacrossin—Estate of Major Fox—Sale of estate, reinstatement of Miss Masterson, etc., *Aug. 4*, 992.
- Ballynahinch.
  - Liquor, Illegal sale of, alleged, *Aug. 1*, 264.
  - River, Illegal netting in—Belfast Anglers' Association, rights, etc., *Aug. 4*, 989.
- Bangor, Ireland—Estimate for Harbour, Amount to be contributed by Department of Agriculture, etc., *Aug. 4*, 986.
- Belfast Lough, Illegal Trawling in, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 721.
- Bennett Estate—Fair rent appeal of J. Dooley, Supply of Report of Court Assessor, etc., *Aug. 2*, 535.
- Beresford Estate, proceedings as to sale of, *Aug. 4*, 988, 989.
- Boyne River—Close season for salmon fishing—Assimilating dates in different districts, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 274.
- Burke, Isadore, Estate, sale of—Particulars as to disposal of grazing lands, *Aug. 4*, 974.
- Canals from Monasterevan to Castlecomer—Expenditure of grant-in-aid of construction proposed in 1801, *Aug.* 1, 263.
- Cashen Salmon Fishery, Inquiry as to extinction of, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 994.
- Children, Employment of—Byelaws under the Act, number of, made by Irish local authorities, etc., *July 29*, 88.
- Clanmorris, Lord, Estate of—Particulars as to negotiations for sale, *Aug. 4*, 973.
- Colehill—Gamekeeper's right to demand production of Licence on Public Road, *Aug. 4*, 993.
- Congested Districts Board—Transactions under Land Act 1903, up to 31 July, 1904, Particulars as to, *Aug. 4*, 971.
- Constabulary, Royal Irish.
  - Anderson, Constable, Charges against, and Dismissal from the Force, *Aug. 3*, 759–770, 785.
    - Official Papers etc., relating to, Tabling, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 724.
    - Second Inquiry, Circumstances of, Suppression of Evidence, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 724, 725.
    - Sheridan Case, Denial of Connection with—Tabling Papers of Sheridan Case, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 728.
  - Armagh—Flags Displayed on Licensed Premises, Prohibition of, by Constabulary, etc., *Aug. 3*, 715.
  - Complaints against, Notice as to Procedure in, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1556.

Wyndham, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*

- Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*
  - Dublin County, South—Arrangements as to Manning certain Police Stations—Tabling Correspondence proposed, *Aug. 3*, 728.
  - Extra Police, Charges for.
    - Legal Powers of Recovery, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1365, 1366.
    - Method of levying, in Certain Counties, *Aug. 3*, 783–785.
  - Glanquin, Force Stationed at, *Aug. 4*, 993.
  - Recruits, Number of, for Year ended 31st March, 1904, *Aug. 3*, 726.
  - Retirement, Regulations as to, *Aug. 5*, 1217.
  - Robinson, Constable — Marriage against Regulations, and refusal to support Wife, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1359.
  - Rowndstone—Display of Flags on Licenced Premises, Illegal Prohibition by Constabulary, Complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc., *Aug. 1*, 272; *Aug. 3*, 786, 787; *Aug. 4*, 955.
  - Prisoners, Police Testimony as to Character of, *Aug. 5*, 1217.
- Cookstown Disturbances, Inquiry as to, *Aug. 4*, 991; *Aug. 8*, 1361, 1364.
- Cooscroum Boat Slip, Improvement of, proposed, *Aug 8*, 1358.
- Cork
  - Mahony, Mr. T., Land Appeal of, Reason for Postponement of Hearing, *Aug. 1*, 277, 278.
  - Port Sanitary Authority, Powers of, to make Byelaws as to smallpox, *Aug. 1*, 276, 277.
  - Queen's College—Examination in Arts, distinctions gained, etc., *Aug. 3*, 728, 730.
  - Show, Conveyance of horses to—Insufficiency of arrangements by Great Southern and Western Railway alleged, *Aug. 2*, 532.
- Correspondence, Official from heads of Departments, Change in Regulations as to address, etc., *Aug 2*, 532.
- County Courts, Ireland—Roscommon and Leitrim—Amalgamation of duties connected with judgeship, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1362.
- Crossgar Water Supply—Delay in bringing new wells into use, etc., *Aug. 4*, 971.
- Cusack Estate, Sale of—Issue of reques, under Section 7 of Land Act of 1903, *Aug. 4*, 987.
- Dillon Estate, Sale of—Progress of negotiations, *Aug. 8*, 1363.
- Doohoma School, Illtreatment of children at, by master, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 533.
- Dopping Estate, Application as to sale of, *Aug. 1*, 277.
- Down, County, Increase in rents in, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1365.
- Dromore and Dromara District—Fees paid to Petty Sessions Clerk for Committals of Lunatics, *Aug. 4*, 969.

Wyndham, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Dublin
  - Marlborough Street Training College—Arrangements as to new building *Aug. 8*, 1359.
  - Trinity College—Irish Church Act, Receipts under, Particulars as to expenditure of, *Aug. 2*, 534.
- Dublin County, South—Police arrangements as to Manning certain Stations, Tabling correspondence proposed, *Aug. 3*, 728.
- Dungannon School, Delay in erecting, *Aug. 4*, 990.
- Ely, Marquess of, sale of estates of—Progress of negotiations, *Aug. 4*, 970.
- Education
  - Doohoma School, Illtreatment of children at, by master, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 533.
  - Dublin—Marlborough Street Training College—Arrangements as to new building, *Aug. 8*, 1359.
  - Dungannon School, delay in erecting, *Aug. 4*, 990.
  - Irish Language—Inquiry as to examinations at St. Luke's School, Cork, *Aug. 8*, 1360.
  - National School Teachers, *see that sub-heading.*
  - University, facilities for, *Aug. 3*, 803-805.
- Evictions
  - Ballymacrossin—Estate of Major Fox. Reinstatement of Miss Masterson, *Aug. 4*, 992.
  - Kerry, Land Commission Evictions—Compassionate payment to tenants by Congested Districts Board, *Aug. 2*, 533.
  - King-Harman Estate
    - Armstrong, R., Reinstatement of, *Aug. 2*, 531.
    - Fox, P., Reinstatement of, *Aug. 3*, 724.
  - Kingston Estate—Applications for reinstatement, *Aug. 9*, 1564.
  - Lansdowne Estate—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *Aug. 4*, 992.
  - Limerick—Applications for Reinstatement received from Hartigan and D. M'Carthy, *Aug. 3*, 723.
  - Marshall Estate—Applications for Reinstatement, *Aug. 8*, 1360.
  - Mohill—Applications from J. Maguire for Reinstatement, *Aug. 1*, 275.
  - Trench, Mr. B. B., Estate of—Reinstatement of Mrs. Kennedy, *Aug. 4*, 988.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Act relating to Flax and Linen Industry, Omission of, from Schedule, proposed, *Aug. 9*, 1703.
- Fair Rents—Appeals
  - Bennett Estate—Appeal of J. Dooley, Supply of Report of Court Assessor, etc., *Aug. 2*, 535.

Wyndham, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Fair Rents—Appeals—*cont.*
  - King's County Appeals heard on 28th April—Reason for increase in rents, *Aug. 2*, 535.
  - Limerick East—Date of hearing Appeals, *Aug. 3*, 723.
  - Mitchelstown—Rent of Mr. P. Ahern, *Aug. 9*, 1565.
- Fisheries
  - Boyne River, close time for Salmon Fishing in—Assimilating dates in different districts, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 274.
  - Cashen Salmon Fishery, Inquiry as to extinction of, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 994.
- Fitzwilliam, Earl, Estate of—Number of Ejectment Notices served, *Aug. 4*, 991.
- Glanquin, Constabulary Force stationed at, *Aug. 4*, 993.
- Herault, Victor de l', Administration of Estate of, by the Crown, carrying out Provisions of Madame de l' Herault's Will, etc., *Aug. 4*, 987.
- Irish Language, Instruction in, at National Schools—Inquiry as to Examinations at St. Luke's School, Cork, *Aug. 8*, 1360.
- Irish Office—Correspondence from Heads of Departments, Change in Regulations as to Address, etc., *Aug. 2*, 532.
- Irish Society, Mortgages on Estates of, Particulars as to, *Aug. 1*, 263.
- Kerry.
  - Fishing in—Reduction in Close Season to Rod Anglers, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 994.
  - Land Commission Evictions — Payment of Sum to Tenants by Congested Districts Board, *Aug. 2*, 533.
- Kilbride Camp Canteen Licence, Irregularity in Signing, by Magistrate—Decision as to Action of Mr. Shanks, *Aug. 1*, 278.
- King-Harman Estate, Sale of
  - Reinstatement of P. Fox, Evicted Tenant, *Aug. 3*, 724.
  - Exclusion of W. H. Plant from Sale, Reinstatement of R. Armstrong, Evicted Tenant, etc., *Aug. 2*, 531.
- King's County—Fair Rent Appeals heard on April 28, Reason for Increase of Rents, *Aug. 2*, 535.
- Kingston Estate—Applications for Reinstatement from Evicted Tenants, *Aug. 9*, 1564.
- Kinvara Pier and Harbour, Improvement of, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 273.
- Labourers' Cottages.
  - Grant, Allocation of Unissued Balances of, *Aug. 4*, 995.
  - Loans, Particulars as to Rates of Interest on, etc., *Aug. 3*, 726; *Aug. 4*, 956.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Labourers' Cottages—*cont.*
  - Occupation of, by other than *bonâ fide* Labourers, Prevention of—Number of Complaints, etc., *Aug. 3*, 727.
- Land Commission.
  - Down Co., Increase in Rents in, alleged, *Aug. 8*, 1365.
  - Kerry Evicted Tenants, Compassionate Payment to, by Congested Districts Board, *Aug. 2*, 533.
  - Mahoney, Mr. T., Appeal of, Reason for Postponement of Hearing, *Aug. 1*, 277, 278.
- Land Judge's Court—Nicholson Estate, Administration of—Utilisation of Grazing Farm to Enlarge Small Holdings, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 275.
- Land Purchase.
  - Antrim—Estates of Earl of Shaftesbury—Price asked, etc., *Aug.* 8, 1365.
  - Athenry, Graig Abbey—Purchase of Grazing Land, proposed, *Aug. 4*, 995.
  - Ballymacrossin—Estate of Major Fox, *Aug. 4*, 992.
  - Beresford Estate, Proceedings as to Sale of, *Aug. 4*, 988, 989.
  - Burke, Isadore, Estate, Sale of—Particulars as to disposal of Grazing Lands, *Aug. 4*, 974.
  - Clanmorris, Lord, Estate of—Particulars as to Negotiations for Sale, *Aug. 4*, 973.
  - Cusack Estate—Issue of Request under Section 7 of Land Act 1903, *Aug. 4*, 987.
  - Dillon Estate—Progress of Negotiations, *Aug. 8*, 1363.
  - Dopping Estate, Applications as to, *Aug. 1*, 277.
  - Dunraven, Lord, Limerick Estate of, *Aug. 3*, 729.
  - Ely, Marquess of, Sale of Estate of—Progress of Negotiations, *Aug. 4*, 970.
  - Grazing Lands, Return as to Proposals to Purchase, suggested, *Aug. 4*, 972.
  - King-Harman Estate, Sale of, Exclusion of W. H. Plant from, *Aug. 2*, 531.
  - Rowe Estate—Vesting of Sporting Rights, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1362.
  - Southwell, Lord, Limerick Estate of, *Aug. 3*, 729.
  - Tenants-for-life, Judicial Decision as to Payment of Bonus to, Under Section 48—Number of Sales Postponed or Abandoned in Consequence of Decision, *Aug. 4*, 987.
  - Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 4*, 987.
  - Transactions Under Act of 1903 up to 31 July, 1904, Particulars as to, *Aug. 4*, 971.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Lansdowne Estate—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *Aug. 4*, 992.
- Licences, Gun and Game, Gamekeeper's Right to Demand Production of, on Public Road, *Aug. 4*, 993.
- Limerick.
  - Dunraven, Lord, Sale of Estate of, *Aug. 3*, 729.
  - Evictions—Applications for Reinstatement received from Hartigan and D. M'Carthy, *Aug. 3*, 723.
  - Fair Rent Appeals, Date of Hearing, *Aug. 3*, 723.
  - Police, Extra, Charges for — Legal Powers of Recovery, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1365.
  - Southwell, Lord, Sale of, Estate of, *Aug. 3*, 729.
- Liquor Licensing, etc.
  - Ballynahinch, Illegal Sale of Liquor in, alleged, *Aug. 1*, 264.
  - Six-day Licence, Extension of, and Rescinding of Order, Action as to, *Aug. 3*, 715.
- Local Government Board — Surcharges, Information as to, *Aug. 3*, 726: *Aug. 8*, 1363.
- Londonderry.
  - Motor Car Service Under Iveagh-Pirrie Scheme, Cost of, etc., *Aug. 3*, 721.
  - Prison Warders — Duties, Religious Denominations, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1343 1344.
- Lunatics.
  - Asylums—Assistant Medical Officers, Number of, Number Married, etc., *Aug. 2*, 530.
  - Committals, Fees paid to Dromore and Dromara Petty Sessions Clerk for, *Aug. 4*, 969.
- Macroom Union Clerkship, Decision as to, *Aug. 3*, 727.
- Maghera—Exhibition of Disloyal Notices Against Recruiting, *Aug. 8*, 1367.
- Mahony, Mr. T., Land Appeal of, Reason for Postponement of Hearing, *Aug. 1*, 277, 278.
- Marshall Estate—Applications for Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *Aug. 8*, 1360.
- Milford, Disturbances at, Police Arrangements, etc.—Inquiry Proposed, *Aug. 4*, 955.
- Mitchelstown Fair Rent Appeal—Reason for Raising Rent of Mr. Ahern, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1565.
- Mohill, Evicted Tenant at—Application from J. Maguire for Reinstatement, *Aug. 1*, 275.
- Monasterevan, Canal from, to Castlecomer Projected in 1801—Expenditure of Grant in-Aid, *Aug. 1*, 263.
- Motor Car Service under Iveagh-Pirrie scheme, Cost, benefits, etc., of, *Aug. 3*, 721, 722.
- Moy and Trew Station, Names and Area of Townlands between, *Aug. 3*, 716.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
National School Teachers.
Assistant, Average School attendance required for Appointment of, Provision for Reduction of, *Aug. 2*, 530; *Aug. 3*, 729.
Dismissals, Regulations as to, *Aug. 9*, 1565.
Promotions of Male Principal Teachers since 1903, *Aug. 2*, 521.
Reports, Regulations as to marking "excellent" by Inspectors, *Aug. 4*, 970; *Aug. 8*, 1344.
Salaries.
Reduction of, owing to decrease in Attendance from cause beyond Control of Teacher—Payment of full Salary, Proposed, *Aug. 1*, 262.
Teacher of School, Roll No. 8145—Delay in receiving Increment of Salary, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 520.
Newcastle—Police testimony as to Character of Prisoners—Letter written by Head Constable Smith, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1217.
Nicholson Estate, Administration of, by Land Judge's Court—Utilisation of grazing Farm for enlarging small holdings, Proposed, *Aug. 1*, 275.
Piers and Harbours.
Bangor — Estimate for Harbour, Amount to be contributed by Department of Agriculture, etc., *Aug. 4*, 986.
Kinvara, Improvements of, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 273.
Poor Law
Guardians, Powers of—Case ot John Morris, *Aug. 4*, 990.
Officials.
Assistant Teacher and Catechist, Abolition of Office of, in Armagh, Pension granted to Miss M'Kee, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1218.
Macroom Union Clerkship, decision as to, *Aug. 3*, 727.
Religious denominations of, in Armagh, *Aug. 5*, 1218.
Portadown Disturbances, Result of Inquiry as to, *Aug. 3*, 722.
Queen's College, Cork—Examinations in Arts, distinctions gained, etc., *Aug. 3*, 728, 730.
Railways.
Great Southern and Western—Insufficiency of arrangement for conveyance of Horses to Cork Show, alleged, *Aug. 2*, 532.
Tireragh district, Petition for Construction in, *Aug. 1*, 275.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Rathmines Commissioners, Appeal of, against order of Dublin County Council, Decision as to, *Aug. 1*, 278.
Roman Catholic University for Ireland, proposed, *Aug. 3*, 802.
Roscommon and Leitrim—Amalgamation of duties connected with County Court Judgeship, proposed, *Aug. 8*, 1362.
Roundstone—Display of flags on licensed premises, Illegal prohibition of, by Constabulary, complaint from Rev. Mr. Gleeson, etc., *Aug. 1*, 272; *Aug. 3*, 786, 787; *Aug. 4*, 955.
Rowe Estate, Sale of—Vesting of sporting rights, etc., *Aug. 8*, 1362.
Smallpox, Powers of local authorities to make Byelaws as to, under Public Health Act—Request of Cork Port Sanitary Authorities, etc., *Aug. 1*, 276, 277.
Southwell, Lord, Sale of Limerick Estate of, *Aug. 3*, 729.
Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 4*, 987.
Tireragh District, County Sligo, Petition for construction of Railway in, *Aug. 1*, 275.
Trawling, illegal, in Belfast Lough, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 721.
Trench, Mr. B. B., Estate of—Reinstatement of evicted tenant, *Aug. 4*, 988.
Trinity College, Dublin—Irish Church Act, receipts under—Particulars as to expenditure, *Aug. 2*, 534.
Under-Secretary.
M'Donnell, Sir Antony, Reason for appointment of, *Aug. 3*, 785.
Undue interference of, in Irish Affairs, alleged, *Aug. 3*, 759, 770.

Yeomanry
Expenditure on, increase in.
Os. Sir A. Hayter, *Aug. 8*, 1404; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1466
South African War, number serving in, number granted honorary Army rank, etc.
Q. Sir L. Knowles; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Aug. 8*, 1350.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]
National School Teachers, Ireland—Salaries, Reduction of, owing to decrease in attendance from cause beyond control of teacher—Payment of full salary, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 262.

Zouche of Haryngworth, Lord
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 4*, 897–900; Rep. *Aug. 8*, 1308.